

Instructions. This is a blind peer-review process. You are not allowed to disclose whose reports you are reviewing. For strict compliance.

Evaluator: _____

Report Evaluated: _____

Total: _____

Q1

Does the report have an **Executive Summary** that contains?

- Problem statement
- Brief description of data (the source)
- The model implemented
- Result (prediction accuracy)
- Insights

Criteria	Score [0 or 1]
Does the report have an executive summary ?	
Does the executive summary contain a problem statement ?	
Does the executive summary introduce the dataset under study	
Does the executive summary briefly introduce the model(s) used?	
Does the executive summary present/discuss important results ?	
Does the executive summary properly communicate the relevant insights in the study?	

Q2

Does the report have a section on **Data Description and Processing**?

** The section title need not be the same nor do they have to be under one section.*

Criteria	Score
The report describes the raw data properly and provides simple, but relevant statistics. [0 to 2 pts]	

Q3

Does the report have a section on **Exploratory Data Analysis**?

Do the analyses provide descriptions and rationale for their implementation? For example, if data are visualized and pair plots or swarm plots are provided in the EDA, does the author explain why they are there and what insights are gleaned from the visualizations? If correlations and/or probability distributions are provided, does the author elaborate on them?

Criteria	Score
<p>Do the analyses provide descriptions and rationale for their implementation? For example, if data are visualized and pair plots or swarm plots are provided in the EDA, does the author explain why they are there and what insights are gleaned from the visualizations? If correlations and/or probability distributions are provided, does the author elaborate on them? [0 to 4 pts]</p> <p>0 - None 2 - Partially complete; no sufficient descriptions 3 - Complete with descriptions; no added insights 4 - Complete with descriptions plus insights</p>	
<p>Figures/Plots. Does the report provide figures and plots? Do the figures and plots have proper labeling? Are there descriptive captions? [0 to 2 pts]</p> <p>0 - none 1 - incomplete 2 - very good</p>	

Q4

Models and Results. Does the report have a model (methodology) section where details on the model implementation are provided? Does it present results in a systematic manner?

Criteria	Score
<p>Feature Extraction and Feature Engineering. Does the report discuss how the author chose the features in the study? Does the author implement dimensionality reduction? Does the report justify the choice of parameters? [0 to 3 pts]</p> <p>0 - no discussion on feature extraction nor feature engineering 1 - implements a dimensionality reduction algorithm, but does not discuss further 2 - implements a dimensionality reduction algorithm and describes the algo, then interprets result from feature engineering 3 - implements a dimensionality reduction algorithm then describes the algo and interprets result from feature engineering, and explores different parameter choices</p>	
<p>Clusters. Did the author implement cluster analysis to solve the problem? Does the report describe and discuss the clustering algorithm and the hyperparameters used? [0 to 3 pts]</p> <p>0 - no discussion of a clustering algorithm 1 - implemented a clustering algorithm, but did not discuss nor elaborate 2 - implemented a clustering algorithm and described & discussed what the algorithm is 3 - implemented a clustering algorithm and described & discussed what the algorithm is; further, exploration of hyperparameters were also presented (e.g. if <i>k</i>-means clustering, author used different values of <i>k</i>)</p>	
<p>Hyperparameter. Does the report present insights on the use of the parameters – the limitations, if there exist? [0 to 2 pts]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - no discussion on hyperparameters 1 – put values in the parameters (e.g. TF-IDF parameters, SVD parameters), but didn't elaborate on the choice of values 2 – put values in the parameters and describes the choice and potential limitations, if they exist 	
<p>Sound results. Do the results make sense? [0 to 3 pts]</p> <p>0 - no clear results presented 1 - the results do not make sense as the approach is clearly flawed; or, the results are okay but do not follow from the methods 3 - the results make sense</p>	

<p>Insights. The report presents interesting insights** gleaned from data and results. Author talks about important features and why they are strong predictor variables. Author also discusses the different clusters identified. [0 to 4 pts]</p> <p>0 - no discussion whatsoever on insights, nor can they be obtained from the presented results 1 - no insights <i>explicitly</i> discussed, but can already be obtained from results 2 - interesting insights on either features or clusters 4 - interesting insights on both features and clusters that can be traced back to the methods and discussion results</p> <p>** not necessarily technical</p>	
--	--

Q5

Scraper Code: Code quality and documentation

Criteria	Score
<p>Code quality. The code is efficient and collects data in a safe manner [0 to 4 pts]</p> <p>0 - no code provided 1 – Code is provided but is neither efficient nor safe 2 – Code is efficient or collects data in a safe manner but not both 4 – Code is efficient and collects data in a safe manner</p>	
<p>Code documentation. The code is fully documented [0 to 2 pts]</p> <p>0 - no code documentation 1 – Code is partially documented 2 – Code is fully documented</p>	

Q6

Overall Report Assessment: Completeness, Authenticity/Originality, etc.

Criteria	Score [0 or 1]
References and Acknowledgment. Does the report have a References and Acknowledgments section?	
As far as the reviewer can tell, does it appear that the final technical report submitted for this project is a product of the student who submitted it?	

Final Comments:
