ES218 Project – Peer review

Make sure to read the following guidelines before proceeding:

* Note that you (as the reviewer) will need to check that all the packages used in the project’s script are installed on your computer. You will know if a package is missing from your computer if the RMD file fails to knit (the error message should be self-explanatory).
* You are all expected to know how to diagnose knitting errors. If errors do present themselves you are to document them in this review. In most cases you should be able to fix them (if I deem a knitting error too difficult to diagnose, I’ll contact the reviewers independently).
* When completed, commit this document to the author’s github repo.

1. Project being reviewed (this is the author name):  
   Reviewer: Jimmy Kieu Reviewee: Makaylah Cowan
2. Evaluate each criterion on a score from 1 to 5 (5 being best):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Description | Score  ( 1 to 5 ) |
| Complexity of analysis | * Was the analysis thorough? * Did the nature of the analysis involve complex coding procedures? * Did the author go above and beyond what was expected?  (note that a score of 5 should be assigned judiciously) | 4.5 |
| Reproducibility | * Was the “knitting” of the Rmd file error free? **(if the knitting process produces an error, 3 points should be automatically deducted)** * Were all warnings and messages suppressed from the output? | 5 |
| Presentation  &  Code quality | * Was the document carefully constructed with properly sized figures? * Were the code chunks clear and properly commented? * Were all loaded packages used as intended by the author? | 4 |
| Discussion | * Did the author clearly layout a narrative? * Were the figures and analyses appropriate for what the author was trying to convey? | 4 |

1. Provide thoughtful and constructive feedback. *For example, how could the analysis be improved? Were there errors in the code, if so, what fixes were needed? Are there portions of the script that could have been simplified or re-written in a more succinct way? Did the figures match the narrative? Were there aspects of the analysis that you found novel or unique? Did you learn something new while reviewing the write-up?  
   Make sure to format any code chunks used in your write-up using* ***Courier New*** *font (and maybe change its font color too to distinguish it from the text). Also, indicate the Rmd line number(s) being referenced. You are free to embed snapshots of the html output or Rmd sections via Insert >> Screenshots >> Screen clipping.*

I thought the introduction set up an interesting narrative that people might not typically think about. LAX is a very large airport and it would be interesting to see how changes in relative humidity and/or temperature affect performance. The intro also clearly laid out the procedures of the analysis. There were a couple of spots that I indicated where the code could be a bit more succinct (e.g. adding certain lines into a piping operation rather than separately. Overall, I think the analysis was appropriate for the narrative established. The conclusion could be expanded upon. There was not really any reference back to the ideas proposed in the introduction. I included some comments how to expand the discussion as comments on the code.