## Final lab GSI grade

Name *						
Mengling Liu						
Student ID *						
3033122406						
Readability *  Narrative unclear and/or difficult to read	1	2	3	4	5	Narrative very clear and/or easy to read
Grammar *						
Incorrect written grammar pervasive	1	2	3	4	5	Excellent written grammar

## Comments on readability and grammar

Throughout the report there is a need for more context. For example at the beginning as opposed to just diving straight in to talk about the data you need to give background about the problem you are trying to solve with the data.

Additionally, there are a number of typos and grammatical mistakes

Quality of explora	atory data	analysis *			
	0	1	2	3	
Did not perform EDA					Performed a thorough EDA and presented appropriate and appealing figures that highlighted the interesting parts of the data
Comments on El	DA				
Appropriateness	of regres	sion methoo	ds <b>*</b> 2	3	
Did not appropriately choose or implement regression methods	0				Made sensible decisions in terms of choosing and implementing regression methods
Comments on re model for each v sense)	_	•	•	-	
Your choice of metho		oriate but more	e discussion ab	oout why the	y are appropriate for

In addition you do not address how you will handle the 20 voxels. Will you do a separate model

for each?

Explained each o	f the mod	lel selection	criteria (CV	, ESCV, AIG	C, AICc, BIC) *
	0	1	2	3	
Did not explain the model selection criteria					Clearly outlines what each model selection criteria does and the relative pros and cons of each criteria
Correctly implemusing the correct		-			ria (including
	0	1	2	3	
Did not compare model selection criteria					Correctly implemented the criteria, discussed strengths and weaknesses, and provided insightful figures for the comparison
Comments on im selection criteria	•	ition and co	mparison of	modeling	g and model
Good discussion of t	he pros and	cons			
It is more appropriate in the paper	e with this da	ata to use corre	elation instead	of MSE for t	he CV as discussed
You did not seem to different criteria)	do any comp	parison of the r	model sizes (i.e	e. lambdas cl	nosen for the

Evaluation of mo	del perf	ormance	and diag	nostic pl	ots *	
	0	1	2	3	4	
Did not evaluate model performance  Comments on managements of man	odel per	• formance	e evaluat	ion and c	diagnosti	Thoroughly evaluated how well the models performed using correlation (including testing final model on a test set) and provided insightful and appealing figures for diagnostic plots and model interpretation
You need to do more body of the report.	than just p	orint out a t	able for the	e validation	. It must b	e discussed in the
Interpretation of	models 0	<b>*</b> 1		2	3	
Did not try to interpret the models		•		0	0	Provided a thorough interpretation of the models
Comments on m	odel inte	erpretatio	n			
You don't really seem features and if feature discuss how this rela	res are stal	ole across b	ootstrap s	amples. It		

Evaluation of model stability *							
	0	1	2	3			
Did not discuss model stability				•	Reasonably explored and discussed model stability		
Comments on mo	del stabilit	ty evaluatior	า				
Good job in this part							
Did the student provide all files and instructions in their github repo necessary for reproducing the results and report *							
	0	1	2	3			
Did not provide anything required for reproducibility					Everything was provided and clearly named/describe d		
General comment	is						

This form was created inside of UC Berkeley.

Google Forms