GROUP – 5

The analysis was mostly descriptive in nature and most time was spent on data observation than analysis of the key features considered. Key independent variable selection was done but without much research or business insights. Not a lot was done to base the accuracy or the claims such as residual analysis. The chosen model wasn’t compared to models of other techniques. The slides were static and plain with white background. No relevant design to the topic was present in the slides. Few images and graphs and a lot of words. The presentation style was fast and precise but the time limit was exceeded. The flow could be improved with better use of pauses, clauses and relevancy. The audience level want considered, the statistical side of analysis overtook the business conclusions and analysis.

Group – 6

The technique used was clearly researched and pre-analysis was done extensively to choose the appropriate model, outliers were mentioned and handled. The findings mentioned were useful but were very short. Although the conclusion was short, the analysis of the claims was well based and researched with different plots and differences. But since the findings were really short, a good business conclusion could not be formulated. The slide design was static with irrelevant images. The colours used were not vibrant. The slides mostly contained words and not a lot of images and graphs were used. The oral presentation could be improved, the flow was pretty bad and robotic. Good pauses and contiguous terms have to be used. The audience level was considered more statistic than business oriented. Only the conclusion part of the presentation could be understood by business people.

Group – 7

The question was well built and the technique used was established well with good analysis both descriptive and statistical. Usage of images, graphs and matrices were explicit and well though of. All time periods (past, present and future) analysis was present with good business findings. Good selection of predictors and the analysis of the predictors chosen was descriptive. The findings from the model were interpreted well and the key points were brought to light. The conversion of statistical understandings to business world was clear. Not much was done to claim the accuracy of the technique used such as residual analysis etc. The model used was not compare to models from other techniques. The quality of the slides was really good, professional. The choice of colours and text put up a clear presentation. Good number of images, graphs and words were used in equal consideration. The oral presentation was clear with good flow and the choice of words were good as well. The audience knowledge level was considered on an equal basis, the findings and suggestions were well represented for both statistical and business use.