

# Lab 1 Student grades final

Please provide feedback for the lab 1 you received. The results of this form will be shared with the original author of the report so please provide constructive feedback, for example, "Figure 4 would be clearer if the author increased use of transparency", rather than simply saying things like "Figure 4 was just terrible: I couldn't see anything in that plot!".

Student ID of the student whose paper you are grading \*

24092167

Name of student \*

Alexander Brandt

Completeness of report \*

- ☒ Discussed the measurement of interesting variables
- ☒ Discussed data cleaning
- ☒ Provided a graphical critique of the original paper
- ☒ Discussed Finding 1
- ☒ Discussed Finding 2
- ☒ Discussed Finding 3
- ☒ Provided code necessary for recompiling the report (even if you didn't manage to recompile the report)

**Readability of report (5 points) \***

	1	2	3	4	5	
Narrative unclear and/or difficult to read	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Narrative very clear and/or easy to read

**Grammar of report (5 points) \***

	1	2	3	4	5	
Incorrect written grammar pervasive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Excellent written grammar

**Level of detail on data cleaning and collection (3 points) \***

	1	2	3	
Very little detail (unclear what was done to clean the data)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Very detailed

**Validity of data cleaning (in code or in writeup) (2 points) \***

- ☒ Found that there were two trees
- ☒ Carefully thought about (i.e. discussed in their report) which outliers to remove
- ☐ Noticed that there was an inverse ( $1/x$ ) relationship between the voltage of the network and the log datasets
- ☐ Noticed that the reported dates were weird in one way or another
- ☐ Noticed that the time zones were incorrect
- ☒ Noticed other inconsistencies in the data

### Relevance of figures (excluding findings) in report (4 points) \*

	1	2	3	4	
Low relevance (did not really add anything to the report or were not discussed in the body of the report)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely relevant (each figure added something substantial to the report)

### Quality of figures (excluding findings) in report (4 points) \*

	1	2	3	4	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

### Discuss one or more things that you liked about the figures \*

Simple and clear!

---

### Discuss one or more things that could be improved about the figures \*

There was only one figure related to data cleaning, and while it was very clear (histograms), a lot more could have been done to explore and describe the cleaning process visually.

Figure labels and captions would be very helpful!

---

### Graphical critique from the original paper (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Did not have much to say	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Clearly outlined the pros and/or cons of the graphs

### Reproducibility of report (4 points) \*

	1	2	3	4	
Could not recompile the report	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Could recompile the report and got the same output as provided in the original pdf

If you could not recompile the report, or got different output, explain what went wrong

---

### Readability of code (4 points) \*

	1	2	3	4	
Code very difficult to read with little documentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Code easy to read with clear documentation

### Suggestions to improve code (either provide specific examples or general comments) \*

Some of your lines are very long. Try to follow the google style guide which states that no lines should be longer than 80 characters.

Much of your code could be improved in terms of efficiency and clarity by using the syntax from the dplyr package and the tidyverse in general.

For example,

```
Apr.30.selection.node <- Apr.30.selection[Apr.30.selection$nodeid == 197,]
```

could instead be written as

```
Apr.30.selection.node %>% filter(nodeid == 197)
```

which is much more concise and readable!

---

### Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 1 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

### Visual quality of figure for Finding 1 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

### Optional comments about Finding 1

This finding feels a little more like a data cleaning step than a finding about the tree itself. It is an artifact of the data collection rather than something interesting happening to the tree!

Overplotting means that it is hard to tell if there are lots of blue points hidden behind the red points. Perhaps increased transparency or subsampling would help!

---

### Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 2 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

### Visual quality of figure for Finding 2 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

### Optional comments about Finding 2

Very clear plots.

---

### Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 3 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

### Visual quality of figure for Finding 3 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

### Optional comments about Finding 3

Nice use of plotly to visualize three variables at once :)

---

One or more things that you liked about the report overall \*

Well written and clearly explained.

---

One or more things that could be improved upon \*

Keep working on using some of the R tidyverse stuff - it's nice to see some ggplot, but would be nice to also see some dplyr! Totally fine if you genuinely prefer the syntax of base R though...

---

Any other comments that you would like to add

Please only push the .pdf and .Rnw files. I'd suggest adding a .gitignore for the cache folder, the .gz, .log, etc files.

Careful with LaTeX quotes. Left quotes are `` and right quotes are ".

---

This form was created inside of UC Berkeley.

Google Forms