

Lab 3 GSI grading

GSI feedback

The respondent's email address (**rebeccabarter@berkeley.edu**) was recorded on submission of this form.

The name of the student whose paper you are grading *

Amy Ko

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

24978168



Readability and grammar of written report (5 points) *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Difficult to read and/or poor grammar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Clearly written and excellent grammar

Level of written detail on comparison of R and C++ implementation and runtime (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not write about a comparison of the R and C++ implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Wrote a detailed comparison between the R and C++ implementations

R and C++ code

Review the code written by the author. If you aren't sure of the correctness of the implementation, that's fine, just give a grade and say so in the comments.

Correctly coded the parallelization of k-means and pairwise similarity in R/C++ (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
incorrect implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	seems correct to me

Comments on implementation of parallelization or the similarity measure?

It was not obvious where to find your R implementation. I eventually found it in your .Rmd file, which is fine, but it might have been clearer to provide this as a function in a script separately.

Efficiency and practicality of R and C++ code (3 points) *

	1	2	3	
inefficient (e.g. repeated computations unnecessarily, saved objects unnecessarily, etc)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	very efficient and practical

Suggestions for improving *efficiency* of R and/or C++ code *

C++ code and the R code that you did provide seems very reasonable :)

Does the author satisfy the following code readability requirements? (3 points)

- ☐ Consistent spacing before and after variable assignment and addition symbols (" = ", " + "), and after commas (" , ")
- ☒ No line of code exceeds 80 characters
- ☒ Consistent variable naming (words always separated by one of "_" or ".")

Clarity of variable names (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
variable names are unclear and meaningless (eg `df`, `x`, `data2`, etc)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	variable names are helpful and unambiguous

Quality of code comments (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
there are almost no comments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	the comments explain clearly what is being done and why

Suggestions for improving *readability* of R code *

Overall your code is very readable!

In the Rmd file there are a few places where spacing is inconsistent (e.g. the code on lines 160, 163 and 204).

Did the student provide all code necessary for recompiling their results AND report (note: you do not have to actually reproduce their report) (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
Incomplete code or no .Rnw/.Rmd file provided	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Everything was provided

Clarity of folder structure (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
The folder structure was very confusing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	It was clear what each file corresponded to and there were no surplus files floating around

Optional comments on folder structure and files provided (please provide comments if you docked points for any reason)

Figures



Correctly produced Ben-Hur-type figures (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not provide a figure like Ben-Hur	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Figures look correct

If the Ben-Hur figures do not look correct, what is wrong?

Quality of Ben-Hur Figure 3 replication figures (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not provide a figure like Ben-Hur	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Provided clear and visually appealing figures

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

Very nice and clear figures. I like that you kept the range consistent across each of the histograms.

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

I also prefer lines to points for Figure 2, but I understand that you were trying to closely replicate the paper :).

Justification of conclusions drawn from the Ben-Hur-type figures (3 points)

*

	0	1	2	3	
Did not write about any conclusions drawn from the figures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Clearly outlined interpretations of the figures and drew reasonable conclusions (e.g. found $k = 3$, or some other value, is the best and provides reasons why)

Comments on the conclusions and interpretations of the Ben-Hur type figures *

Very clearly explained.

Conclusion

Provide concluding comments

One or more things that you thought was well done overall *

Your report was excellently communicated and your code was very easy to read.

One or more things that could be improved upon overall *

Perhaps connecting back to the previous lab would have added a layer to your conclusions. Providing your R similarity function in its own R script would have been less ambiguous (your peer reviewers couldn't find it!)

Any other comments that you would like to add?

This form was created inside of UC Berkeley.

Google Forms