

The student ID of the student whose paper you are grading *

24978168

Completeness of report *

- ☒ Provided kernel density plots for temperature
- ☒ Provided Loess plots for temperature against humidity
- ☒ Discussed data cleaning for the linguistic data
- ☒ Investigated two survey questions in terms of geography and one another
- ☒ Discussed dimension reduction (e.g. PCA)
- ☒ Discussed clustering the survey respondents
- ☒ Assessed robustness of a finding
- ☒ Provided code necessary to recompile the report (even if you didn't manage to recompile the report)

Readability of report (5 points) *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Narrative unclear and/or difficult to read	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Narrative very clear and/or easy to read

Grammar of report (5 points) *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Incorrect written grammar pervasive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Excellent written grammar

Analysis: redwood trees

In this section you will assess the actual analysis using kernel density estimation and loess on the redwood trees data.

Detail of kernel density estimation analysis (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not explore different bandwidths or kernels	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Explored a variety of bandwidths and kernels and clearly related these to the bias-variance-tradeoff

Relevance and quality of figures related to kernel density estimation (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not provide any figures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Provided clear, relevant and visually appealing figures

Discuss one (or more) things that you liked about the author's kernel density estimation figures *

Nice use of clear histogram to match the density estimation.

Discuss one (or more) things that could be improved for the author's kernel density estimation figures *

Could have combined these two plots to make a more interesting comparison (i.e., multiple bandwidths for multiple shapes)

Detail of loess smoothing analysis (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not conduct an analysis using a loess smoother	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Explored a variety of bandwidths and polynomials and clearly related these to the bias-variance-tradeoff

Relevance and quality of figures related to loess smoothing (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not provide any figures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Provided clear, relevant and visually appealing figures

Discuss one (or more) things that you liked about the author's loess figures *

Nice use of alpha value to show point density.

Discuss one (or more) things that could be improved for the author's loess figures *

Again, could have combined these two plots to make a more interesting comparison (i.e., multiple bandwidths for multiple polynomials)

Analysis: linguistic survey

Level of detail in the written comparison between two questions (3 points) *

	1	2	3	
Little detail (barely described the relationships between the two questions)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Very detailed (described clearly the geographical groups formed by each question and discussed how the questions were related to one another)

Optional comments about author's analysis of the two questions

Good answer.

Quality and relevance of figures (e.g. maps) for the two questions (3 points)

★

	0	1	2	3	
Did not provide figures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Provided clear, informative, and visually appealing figures

Discuss one (or more) things that you liked about the author's figure(s) *

Good use of labeling the figures so I didn't have to refer to your paragraph and nice legend.

Discuss one (or more) things that could have been improved for the author's figure(s) *

Maybe consider titling the figures, but I don't want to nit-pick.

Discovered that the binary encoding should be aggregated (e.g. in lat-long bins) in order to perform meaningful PCA (or other dimensionality reduction technique) (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
Did not mention that dimensionality reduction did not work well on the binary encoded data	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Found that PCA was ineffective for binary encoding and used aggregated data instead (e.g. grouped by ZIP or lat/long bins)

Discussed clustering and related these clustering results to geography (3 points) (note: deduct a point if the author used lat/long as a variable in their cluster algorithm) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not discuss clustering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Discussed in detail the clusters found in the data and how they related to geography

Optional comments on cluster analysis

Didn't notice the zip code aggregation, and colored PCA by longitude

Quality and relevance of figures related to clustering and geography (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
No figures provided	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Provided clear, informative, and visually appealing figures

Discuss one (or more) things you liked about the author's clustering figures

★

Figures were clear

Discuss one (or more) things that could be improved for the author's clustering figures ★

Maybe include titles on graphs

Analyzed the robustness/stability of a finding (3 points) (give partial points if the author showed stability only by re-running K-means without perturbing the data) ★

	0	1	2	3	
Did not study robustness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Tested in detail the robustness of their finding (e.g. using repeated data perturbations, subsamples, or bootstrapped samples)

Bonus point for a particularly cool visualization (i.e. not just scatter points on a map) (1 bonus point)

☐ The author made a really creative map!

Bonus point for a particularly cool analysis (i.e. answering a question of the data not required by the lab) (1 bonus point)

☐ The author performed a really creative analysis!

Reproducibility

In this section you will assess the reproducibility of the your peer's report. Be sure to take note of any extra README files that explain any extra steps you might need to take to recompile the report. If they have saved their figures in a separate folder, check to see whether there is a script that will automatically produce AND SAVE their figures. If not, take a point off for reproducibility.

Several people will have saved a large file (probably geocoded locations) and used this file in analysis. This is fine if they also provided clear instructions concerning how the reviewer could reproduce this file in an automated way (e.g. by running an R script or calling a function). If they rely on such a file but do not provide instructions about how one could reproduce this file, then take a point off for reproducibility. You do not need to actually regenerate this file.

Reproducibility of report (4 points) *

	1	2	3	4	
Could not recompile the report	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Could recompile the report and figures without manual effort and got the same output as provided in the original pdf

If you could not recompile the report, or got different output, explain what went wrong

Readability of code (4 points) - be sure to look at any files in the R/ folder *

	1	2	3	4	
Code very difficult to read with little documentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Code easy to read with clear documentation

Suggestions to improve code (either provide specific examples or general comments) *

Nice code. Great commenting.

Clarity of folder structure (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
Many excess files not relevant to the report	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	The purpose of each file is clear and there are no excess files in the lab2 folder

Optional suggestions for improving folder structure

Nice .html supplement.

Concluding remarks

In this section you will provide some general feedback to the author.

One or more things that you liked about the report overall *

Overall a clear and engaged lab report that hits all the major points of the data set.

One or more things that could be improved upon *

Maybe take a little more time to connect the analysis and conclusions drawn from the analysis. Your writing is good, your data analysis is good, now it's just about building the bridge between them. Ultimately it's not a reason I took off many (any?) points from, but since so many things went well I am trying to give some form of constructive feedback.

Any other comments that you would like to add?

This form was created inside of UC Berkeley.

Google Forms