# Feedback for Project

STUDENT ID: 5525549

| CRITERIA | MARK | COMMENT |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Framing material, description of data and cleaning | 12 | Abstract seems to be missing. Introduction does not refer to literature at all and reads somewhat like a blogpost instead of a paper, rather informal. The data itself is well presented and its clear how it was cleaned. Some of the more technical features (I mean ones which require understanding of sound recordings) could have been better explained. |
| Questions addressed and methods used | 13 | The aims of the paper are not very clearly laid out. It explores a sufficiently wide range of techniques but no general hypothesis, main question is asked an answered instead the data is explored as the paper progresses and conclusions are drawn here and there. |
| Analysis and discussion/interpretation | 18 | The analysis is detailed and a paper does a good job at not just exploring the observed numerical values but actually interpreting said values. |
| Quality of background/conclusion | 10 | Very little comparison is made to literature all over the paper. Conclusions rather ready like a few summary statements of the kind of work which have been completed instead of explicitly stating conclusions. Limitations are briefly explored, but future research directions are just doing the same kind of research on more data. |
| Quality of Presentation | 12 | Presentation is sufficiently formal but feels a bit dense. Illustrations are not very helpful in understanding the main points but just rather work as small data dumps. |
| TOTAL | 68 |  |