

# FIE401 - Guidelines Peer-Review

Darya Yuferova

## Overview

The purpose of peer-review is to improve:

- Code quality and reproducibility
- Consistency between code and written interpretation
- Understanding of empirical differences across implementations

Important:

- Word limit: 250–500 words
- Insufficient quality of peer-review will result in a warning for Assignment 1
- Repeated insufficient quality in future peer-reviews will result in a “Fail” grade for future Assignments, regardless of the quality of your own analysis

## Submission Instructions

- Submit your peer-review as a comment on Canvas
- Use complete sentences and professional tone
- Do not include personal information
- Address all four rubrics described below

## Rubric 1. Alternative Way of Coding

Suggest at least one alternative way of coding part of the analysis.

Good example

*The regression setup could be simplified by first subsetting only the variables used in the model (e.g., CAR, payment method, controls) into a separate data frame. This would make the regression code more transparent and reduce the risk of including unused variables.*

```
CAR_MA.Reg<-CAR_MA%>%select(carbidder,all_stock,public,deal_value)
```

Weak example

*The code could be written in a cleaner way.*

## Rubric 2. Code Reproducibility

Evaluate whether the code:

- Runs from top to bottom
- Requires no fixes other than changing the working directory

If the code does not compile: - Clearly state what you had to fix - Explain why the issue occurred (e.g., missing object, typo, incorrect indexing)

Good example

*The code did not run without fixes. The regression section referenced a variable that was renamed earlier in the script. After correcting the variable name, the code compiled correctly.*

Weak example

*The code had some errors.*

### Rubric 3. Consistency Between Code and Text

Assess whether the written description in the PDF accurately reflects what the code actually does.

Good example

*The code applies winsorization to bidder CAR and deal size, but this data treatment is not mentioned in the descriptive section of the PDF. This creates a discrepancy between the text and the actual analysis.*

Weak example

*The text mostly matches the code.*

### Rubric 4. Comparison of Results Across Peers

Compare your peers' results to your own results. If results differ:

- Identify which results differ (e.g., coefficient sign, magnitude, significance)
- Propose plausible reasons

Good example

*Compared to our results, the effect of stock payment for private targets is smaller and insignificant. This may be due to the exclusion of hostile deals in their sample, which reduces variation in bidder CAR.*

Weak example

*The results are different from ours, probably because of coding differences.*