OpenCon ReproHack feedback form

Name of participant

Anna Krystalli, Marios Georgiou

Which paper did you attempt? *

Paper #3. The archaeology, chronology and stratigraphy of Madjedbebe (Malakunanja II): a site in northern Australia with early occupation

Team issue URL *

https://github.com/OpenCon-London/OpenCon_London-Doathon/issues/4

Did you manage to reproduce it? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Almost

On a scale of 1 to 10, how much of the paper did you manage to reproduce? *

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
None of it	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(●)	All of it

Briefly describe the procedure followed / tools used to reproduce it.

We reproduced it in two ways. 1) by launching a docker image and running analysis within. 2) Installing the functions (developed as an r package) through devtools and data by forking from github and running the full analysis locally.

What were the main challenges you ran into (if any)?

with docker: the size of the docker file (>2GB) which was unknown prior to downloading and took some time. As package: dependencies (packages and external libraries (eg JAGS)) required to be installed manually. This is clearly stated in the README however so was known.

What were the positive features of this approach?

Docker: reproduction just worked. Apart from the time to download the image it was very quick and straightforward to reproduce. From package: easy to reproduce once dependencies taken care of. Not as big a file as the dockerimage. Can now reuse in own workflows

Any other comments / suggestions on the reproducibility approach?

From package: could be useful to provide an explicit list of the external libraries and r packages required. (was a bit unsure of what's what just using the session info while from the references to JAGS & Xtools, we were unsure if the list was exhaustive). Of course we got it to work without too much effort. One last minor suggestion, for people like myself that tend to dive straight in copying and pasting commands in and reading as I go along, a mention of the manual dependency installation prior to the devtools::github_install command would have saved me a little time (although the wasted time was of course my fault!)

How well was the material documented? *

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Hard to navigate	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉	○	Very well

How could the documentation be improved? *

The only improvement we could suggest (just for folks to satisfy themselves) is to show a bit of the data inputs. (eg see our amended version of the vignette)

What did you like about the documentation? *

A really nice walkthrough of the analysis with decent explanation of what the code is doing at each stage and why as well as additional plots and tables.

After attempting to reproduce, how familiar do you feel with code and method used in the paper? *

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
None the wiser about the analysis approach	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉	Fully walked through the analysis

Any suggestions on how the analysis could be made more transparent?

Not really. Enjoyed playing with the code and data in the rmd and reading more analysis.

Rate the project on reusability of the material *

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Any suggestions on how the project could be more reusable?

Because of the ability to install the functions as a package, their are fully reusable. In conjunction with the rmd, it's really easy to figure out what functions do so although they are quite customised around the project, I imagine they could easily be modified.

Any Final Comments:

Had loads of fun! Thanks for going to the effort and for letting us include your paper!

Contact email

annakrystalli@googlemail.com