

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 *

26917597

Name of student *

Hongxu Ma

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input 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 *

Nice use of viridis

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

Please provide figure labels and captions. Your report should look like a journal paper.

The histograms are not well explained by their headings. It is not clear what each histogram is showing. Try to use english in your plots rather than code.

I think this might be overusing interactivity. If the interactivity doesn't clearly add anything, I'd say don't do it. It is impossible to scroll over every point to see what its height of each point was.

Make sure that your variable names are in English (no one who hasn't seen the data is going to know that humid_temp is actually temperature and I don't know what "hh" is).

The radial plot looks nice, but I don't understand it without a caption. What do all of these numbers mean? Which side is east and which is west? Try to explain to the reader how to read your plot.

I'd also center the plots on the page.

Graphical critique from the original paper (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Did not have much to say	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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

I got a strange error to do with the yaml front-matter (the stuff between the ---- at the beginning of the file). I played around with it a bit to get it to compile and then Rstudio had a fit but did eventually compile.

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) *

More comments would be very helpful.

Try to ensure that none of your lines of code are longer than 80 characters.

Try to use more readable variable names (what is "rd.in.lh"?)

Separating very large code chunks into several smaller, more digestible chunks would also be helpful.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

Optional comments about Finding 1

The title of the y-axis is unclear: what is T? temperature? It feels a bit weird to plot Temp/humidity and then color by temperature. Again, this might be overuse of interactivity.

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

The plot was cut in half by converting to pdf. Try to be more careful with this. The interactive plot itself is quite nice though showing the transition over time. Of all of your plots, this is definitely the best use of interactivity!

One thing I would suggest is to just color between min and max and to have fewer ticks on the y-axis.

You could have written more about the conclusions you drew from this figure and why it is interesting!

Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 3 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

Optional comments about Finding 3

Again, I don't find the radial plot super intuitive. I like your choice of color though and I'm glad to see that you gave more instructions on how to read the plot this time :). I'm not sure that the interactivity adds anything though.

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

I'm happy to see you experimenting with interactivity so extensively (but I do caution against overuse!). Your choice of color schemes are quite visually pleasing!

One or more things that could be improved upon *

I know that English is not your first language, but being able to write with reasonable grammar is extremely important. I understand what you are saying when you write, but there are widespread grammatical errors. I strongly suggest spending some time working on this. I believe that there are many resources available on campus to help non-native speakers with their English writing :).

Any other comments that you would like to add

I graded the pdf rather than the html to be fair to the other students (but I did look at the interactive plots in the html too!). I'd suggest trying to compile the .Rmd file directly to pdf rather than saving the html as a pdf (mostly because it will look much better!). Your report should look like a journal paper! You can still provide a separate html with the interactive plots!

This form was created inside of UC Berkeley.

Google Forms