

Exploratory Question Report Feedback

Written by Kayla Haeussler, For Team Tiger

TLDR:

- Loved your use of many different sources, and your topic is super interesting!
- My feedback is mostly structural. Missing a strategy section and conclusion
- Some of the writing could use polishing to ensure clarity
- The final section, Shanghai, seems a bit random and underdeveloped

Feedback:

Provide a summary of what the authors do in their report.

- The authors are exploring the environmental impacts of online shopping deliveries, and how that. In order to explore this topic they look at the changes in carbon emissions in the e-commerce industry over the last couple of years, the most energy intensive parts of deliveries and a brief case study on delivery times in Shanghai.

Provide High-Level Reflections:

1. Document Organization: What do you think of how the document has been organized? Do you think the authors' organization followed the guidelines from our [Writing to Stakeholders](#) reading? How could the organization be improved?

- i. Your report does not include a strategy section or conclusion. I see you have your methods in your appendix, but I believe according to Nick's website, this should have its own section after the context section, but maybe it's fine to keep it in the appendix
- ii. I do think a conclusion is important and should be added

2. Problem: Do the authors motivate the problem well? In other words, do you understand why they care about their problem? If not, how could their problem statement be refined?

- i. Yes! I think this is a very interesting and unique topic and I found myself hooked from the beginning
- ii. Is the problem that e-commerce shopping has become a lot more popular and as a result of that there is a lot of CO2 emissions? This was my interpretation

3. Question: Do you feel the questions the authors set out to answer are aligned with the problem that motivated their analysis? In other words, is it clear why answering the questions the authors set out to answer would help them address their motivating problem?

- i. I think the first 2 questions are great, but am a little iffy on the 3rd one. I think maybe you are saying that the longer it takes for a package to be delivered, the more resources it uses, so the third question sees how long it takes packages to be delivered. But, at the same time, I didn't interpret the purpose of the report to be to deliver packages to consumers as fast as possible, so this question seems a little out of place.

- 1. That doesn't mean this question should be thrown away! I just think maybe you want to rephrase the question as you have it written in the report to make it more clear to the reader why this Shanghai example is being included and how it relates to the broader question.

4. Analysis: Do you feel the authors' plans for answering their questions are well thought through? In other words, do they have a plan to answer their questions that makes sense? (Given some questions were answered by other groups and the analyses in these reports are very simple, this section will probably be short).

- i. It seems like the majority of your results are pulled from other research papers and I think they are presented well.
- ii. I already expressed my concerns with question 3 earlier, which I think was the question where you did your own Python analysis as opposed to using research. I think the analysis you have for question 3 answers the question, given I assume you weren't able to find data outside of Shanghai, is fine, but again the question doesn't really make sense to me in the context of your problem.

5. Answers: Do you think they actually answered the questions they set out to answer? When you look at their data, where it came from, how they analyzed it, what they measured, etc., do you feel convinced you know the answer to the question the authors set out to answer? How might they have better answered their questions?

- i. Question 1: I am not sure how well the results align with the question. This results section reads more as 'understanding the carbon emissions problem in e-commerce in recent years' as opposed to how pertinent a problem carbon emissions is in e-comm

recently. I like this analysis, but think maybe the text could be tweaked, either rephrasing the question or emphasizing the effect of the problem more so than its factors in the writing.

- ii. Question 2: I think this section answers its question well. It is a bit wordy. I think a lot of this text could be cut down, especially if that made room for a conclusion
- iii. Question 3: see comments above

General Notes

- I would define last mile logistics the first time you use the term. I didn't know what it meant, and while I could infer what it meant, I noticed you defined it later in the results section for the first question, so I think it makes sense to define sooner.
- The writing style feels really different between the 3 questions. I know that is likely because this is a group project and we all work on different parts, but might be good to ensure consistent writing style.
- Might be good to include a citation for the 'warehousing and storage' bullet point
- Your header on the document says 'An exploratory understanding.... Segment in Shanghai.' You only mention Shanghai on the last page so I am assuming this is a typo
- There are a couple sentences in the report that sound like they are missing a word, or just sound clunky.
- I would definitely put in some kind of conclusion where you mention next steps, limitations in the analysis, etc.
- The Shanghai section is super short! I would either flesh it out (see my comments above) or take it out (considering we need 3 questions, this isn't an option)