Tomer’s example

‘

BIG: people’s behavior, analyzed in a model-free way

Sub-point: how do people’s triangle placements compare to the ground truth?

Analysis of people’s placement of the triangle compared to ground truth

Example Conclusion: People are close on x, but not y

Follow up: Does this mean people aren’t good at this task? Not necessarily, it’s possible that their placement of the triangle is a-ok, because there are several degenerate solutions.

So, let’s consider how well people are doing, by comparing their ‘solutions’ to the ground truth, using metrics x,y,z

Analysis of how ‘good’ the placement of the triangle is compared to ground truth, by metrics a-b-c-

Example conclusion: People are ok on metric a but not b (or whatever), and they’re not as good as the ground truth in general.

BIG POINT: Which models can capture people’s placement behavior?

Sub-point: Maybe people are not using a simulation at all, maybe they are using a linear intersection.

Sub-point: Maybe people \_are\_ using a simulation, by randomly sampling a starting position and then moving the triangle, simulating, correcting, until some threshold is reached.

Sub-point: Maybe people are doing [blah]

Analysis: showing model comparison of different models, how well do they match people’s behavior on metrics a-b-c

‘

I think in the current format, you're getting a bit lost in the technical details. Define a sequence of questions that you are trying to answer, each one logically following from the previous one. For each question, what is the analysis that answers it? Then describe the results and interpretation. When you introduce the models, describe each one with enough detail that someone else could reproduce it. Explain why we're considering each model, what the free parameters are, how you fit it, and so on.

Big:

Question 1 (sub-point):

Analysis (Details of the model, so that someone could reproduce it) & Model formulation:

Results:

Follow up:

Question 2 (following the previous one):