

**NAME: Ninaad Akella**

**STUDENT ID: 46860051**

### **Peer Review on Group Project Trial Presentations**

#### **Group: H**

**Topic:** Analysis of Australian Charity Projects and Donations in 2022.

1. Problem formulation was clear and concise with well defined goals for the project.
2. Sufficient information regarding the features of the datasets were not included. None of the features present in any of the dataset were explained as to what they are representing instead the presenter was only reading the names of the dataset. The included screenshot of the dataset was not clear enough to understand the data.
3. The bar chart for the “Charity mission and Revenue Source” in the story telling part was cluttered and not easy to understand.
4. Finally, in this project they could examine what are the issues that are most affecting Australia and what are the percentage of money charities dealing with these issues receive. This could be a way to bring the attention of the public towards these issues which might help increase the donations for these causes.

#### **Group: L**

**Topic:** A Data Science Investigation of Stock Trading Strategies.

1. The presenter mentioned that there were 7 attributes present in the dataset being used but the features of this dataset was not mentioned nor explained.
2. Information regarding the main stakeholders was not provided.
3. In “making the data fit for use” part it was not explained how the pre-processing steps were done, i.e, if there were any missing data, if so how they were handled or if there were any duplicate data if so, how they were managed. Or if there were any outliers in the stock data, if so what was done with them. The presenter mentions at the end of this part that now the data has only 2 attributes left but doesn’t explains why were the other attributes dropped.

4. There were various strategies that were explained in the presentation but as someone with basic to no knowledge in stock trading and minimal understanding of statistics it was hard to understand. That is not to say that the project is bad but rather it means it is hard to understand what the presenters were speaking about if you don't have domain knowledge. Also, there was no story telling part which might have helped me understand what they were trying to convey.

### **Group: J**

**Topic:** Should NBA teams attempt more 3-point shots?

1. Features used in the project were not explained well. Only two of the seventeen features were explained and the rest were not.
2. "Is my data fit for use" part was glanced over with explaining how the irregularities in the dataset such as missing values, wrong values, outliers, messy values were dealt with.
3. For the clustering method, they should try density based clustering algorithms such as DBSCAN or OPTICS clustering algorithms as they might produce a better result for them.