

Sample Peer Review-1

In terms of presentation quality, the presentation did follow every step in data science process, which is easy to keep up with the flow.

However, after the making the data confess part, there should be a transition slide corresponds to each part in the outline so the audience know exactly which step in data science process they are referring to, and some members have issues with their pronunciation, which is a bit hard to understand.

About the problem formulation, the group need to show some historical results why people hardly shift their political views , which is equivalent to give a more concrete evidence to persuade this is also a worth-mentioning problem.

In is my data fit for use part, the group need to explain what is P. Also, they need to justify why min max scaling method is used for all features and why they did not use other methods since the group did not mention anything about outliers in their data and different scaling methods might yield different result.

From making the data confess part to the end of presentation, the group explained really well on how they do the feature selection and also gave a very clear visualization of how each group of division contribute to the 2 main parties in Australia. Moreover, after all they have done, they now know the voting direction of different demographics, which is helpful in developing more targeted election campaigns based on what they mentioned in problem formulation part.

Comments:

Actionable – The review suggests actions such as “the group need to explain what is P. Also, they need to justify why min max scaling method is used for all features and why they did not use other methods”.

Specific – The review does not vaguely present opinions. It provides evidence for what is good and what can be improved. E.g. “the group explained really well on how they do the feature selection and also gave a very clear visualization of how each group of division contribute to the 2 main parties in Australia.”

Creative – The review also brings outside knowledge to help improve the project such as “the group need to show some historical results why people hardly shift their political views , which is equivalent to give a more concrete evidence to persuade this is also a worth-mentioning problem.”

Sample Peer Review – 2

The start had too much info on the slides however the SIR part was well covered, with good analysis and explanations. The higher-level approach is a good for presentations with limited time available. End animations where interesting

Actionable – The review does not incite any action. It just admires the effort.

Specific – The review lacks specificity e.g. “SIR part was well covered, with good analysis and explanations” but it does not specify the what is particularly good about the analysis and explanation. Furthermore it mentions “End animations where interesting” but does not indicate why they are interesting.

Creative – The review is not creative as it does not bring outside knowledge that is helpful in improving the project