

LUND UNIVERSITY



LINEAR AND LOGISTIC REGRESSION

FMSN30

---

# Peer review of Oskar Andersson's Project 1

---

*Authors:*

El-Tayeb BAYOMI

Nora LÜPKES

April 27, 2020

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Peer assessment</b>	<b>2</b>
----------	------------------------	----------

## 1 Peer assessment

- **Does the report have title page, authors, date, page numbers?**  
No, the report does not contain any of the points above. I would recommend Oskar to code in LaTeX for future projects instead of Word. It's much easier to use when writing scientific reports (and looks much better as well).
- **Does the report have an introduction, results and/or conclusions?** It has an introduction and a conclusion but no results. The results are presented in a bullet-type manner, when it's supposed to be presented in regular text with no headings for each subsection 2 a, b, c etc.
- **Has the report been proof read?** I think it has been. But there's not that much text to correct, so...
- **Have language and spelling mistakes been corrected?** Yes...?  
As mentioned above, each point that's been answered contains only a couple of sentences and in some cases only one. It feels like you've answered with half the sentence.
- **Are figures and tables: Numbered? Equipped with suitable captions? Referred to in the text?** No they're not. For point 1. E you mention the prediction interval but you haven't mentioned the confidence interval (which you've plotted in the figure...)
- **Is the text divided into paragraphs and well structured with clear and suitable section headings?** No, there kind of is no text. Only figures and a couple of sentences to accommodate each one.
- **Is the report easy to read, and understandable without access to the project description?** Unfortunately it is not. There needs to be further discussion around each individual point and not only insertion of figures and plots.
- **Have all the tasks in the assignment been completed?** 2b: improvement not answered 2g, 2k, 2l, 2o, 2q, 3e, 3f, 3k are missing 2i: change of parameters + reasoning not answered 2m: which location was chosen as reference? 2p is answered incompletely (plots are probably just in the wrong place, but without captions it's hard to tell). 3d has

its last question missing 3g: variability not answered

- **Does the report contain relevant figures and tables?** 2p and 3a are missing figures.
- **Has all notation been properly introduced and/or explained?** There is no model 3.n 1d: what is C? 1e: what is meant by north side of an interval? 2f: negative change is probably decrease, but unclear 3d: what are blue and what are red points? 3g: model names are unclear
- **Has the model been properly introduced?** 1a, 1b, 2c, 2n, 3h, 3g have no formula or equation, so it is unclear what model was used. What is meant by "explanatory variable" in 1b? 2n: Anova compared two models. Which two were compared? 1f: transform back to regular scale!