**Feedback Summary**

The main issue was that the link to my blog didn’t work, so my peers couldn’t access the content. This led to low scores on most of the rubric because they couldn’t evaluate anything—intro, visuals, ethics, all of it. The only positive feedback I got was on the title and GitHub link, which were decent. Honestly, it was frustrating because the actual content I worked hard on wasn’t even part of the feedback.

**Surprising Feedback**

The main issue was that the link to my blog didn’t work, so my peers couldn’t access the content. This led to low scores on most of the rubric because they couldn’t evaluate anything—intro, visuals, ethics, all of it. The only positive feedback I got was on the title and GitHub link, which were decent. Honestly, it was frustrating because the actual content I worked hard was completely ruined because of my inability to get the link running properly.

**Changes Made**

The first thing I fixed was the blog link. I tested it to make sure it works on different devices and browsers. Then I went through the post, made sure each rubric point was properly addressed, and added things like:

* A strong intro and conclusion.
* Clear motivation behind the project.
* Ethics section to cover considerations like privacy and transparency.
* Improved visuals and examples of web scraping/EDA.

**Lessons from Peer Feedback**

While reviewing others’ work, I realized how important small details like proofreading, flow, and accessibility are. Fixing the blog link was key, but I also learned to approach revisions with more care in general.