Lab 1 Student grades final

Please provide feedback for the lab 1 you received. The results of this form will be shared with the original author of the report so please provide constructive feedback, for example, "Figure 4 would be clearer if the author increased use of transparency", rather than simply saying things like "Figure 4 was just terrible: I couldn't see anything in that plot!".

Student ID of the student whose paper you are grading *

24978168

Name of student *

Amy Ko

Completeness of report *

☑ Discussed the measurement of interesting variables

☑ Discussed data cleaning

☑ Provided a graphical critique of the original paper

☑ Discussed Finding 1

☑ Discussed Finding 2

☑ Discussed Finding 3

☑ Provided code necessary for recompiling 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	○	○	○	○	◉	Narrative very clear and/or easy to read

Grammar of report (5 points) *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Incorrect written grammar pervasive	○	○	○	○	◉	Excellent writen grammar

Level of detail on data cleaning and collection (3 points) *

	1	2	3	
Very little detail (unclear what was done to clean the data)	○	○	◉	Very detailed

Validity of data cleaning (in code or in writeup) (2 points) *

- ☐ Found that there were two trees
- ☑ Carefully thought about (i.e. discussed in their report) which outliers to remove
- ☑ Noticed that there was an inverse (1/x) relationship between the voltage of the network and the log datasets
- ☑ Noticed that the reported dates were weird in one way or another
- ☑ Noticed that the time zones were incorrect
- ☑ Noticed other inconsistencies in the data

Relevance of figures (excluding findings) in report (4 points) *

	1	2	3	4	
Low relevance (did not really add anything to the report or were not discussed in the body of the report)	○	○	◉	○	Extremely relevant (each figure added something substantial to the report)

Quality of figures (excluding findings) in report (4 points) *

	1	2	3	4	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	○	○	◉	○	Extremely clear and visually appealing

Discuss one or more things that you liked about the figures *

An interesting phenomenon in Figure 1! I wonder what is happening here... did you also look at other dates?
Nice simple ggplot theme :)

Discuss one or more things that could be improved about the figures *

Figure 2 has a lot of overplotting. I would suggest either one or both of adding transparency and subsampling. I'm not sure that coloring by height is adding much here

Graphical critique from the original paper (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Did not have much to say	○	○	◉	Clearly outlined the pros and/or cons of the graphs

Reproducibility of report (4 points) *

	1	2	3	4	
Could not recompile the report	○	○	○	◉	Could recompile the report 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) *

	1	2	3	4	
Code very difficult to read with little documentation	○	○	○	◉	Code easy to read with clear documentation

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

Nice use of piping and comments :)

Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 1 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	○	○	◉	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

Visual quality of figure for Finding 1 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	○	○	◉	Extremely clear and visually appealing

Optional comments about Finding 1

Nice simple, clear figure!

Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 2 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	○	◉	○	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

Visual quality of figure for Finding 2 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	○	○	◉	Extremely clear and visually appealing

Optional comments about Finding 2

Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 3 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	○	○	◉	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

Visual quality of figure for Finding 3 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	○	○	◉	Extremely clear and visually appealing

Optional comments about Finding 3

Nice use of a heatmap :)

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

Well written and the figures were simple and to the point!

One or more things that could be improved upon *

Reducing overplotting would greatly improve the early figures.

Any other comments that you would like to add

This form was created inside of UC Berkeley.

Google Forms