Report	Main Message(s)	Audience	Likes	Dislikes	Things not understood	Missing Information
Feelings	 Talking about emotions get more likes and comments Positive posts get more likes; negative posts get more comments 	 Facebook users, councillors (content) Maybe not general public (link to a research paper) General public (simple, general) 	 Details on the methodology Separating out different types of feelings Structure, subheading 	 Axes scales are all different A little too condensed 	Quite subjective categories of feeling	 Error bars not explained Don't know how 'diverse' the data set is.
Names	 Siblings more likely to have names beginning with the same letter than non-siblings. Twins even more likely (+ other connections) 	 Parents (content) General public (medium, short, simple, informal, missing info) 	 Clear and to the point, simple. Amongst the general stats they've given some specific examples 	 No definite structure Easy to misinterpret some info (e.g. identical twins) Graphs not formatted well (looks unprofessional) 	Sawtooth pattern – not explained	 Need to be more explicit about what's included in the data Didn't explain "random chance" thoroughly
Infographic	There was a turning point in the economy 1980	 People educated/intereste d in the topic Journalists? Lots of terminology and content that is subject specific 	 Eye-catching and makes an impression Creative Same x-axis throughout easy to read Different colours to prove Well referenced 	 Leading Lack of explanation on the things being measured Cluttered Baselines not always the same Too much info on each graph Not the most reliable of references 	Everything	
Doggos	Relationship between a dog's rating, and likes/retweets	 Dog lovers (content) @Dog_Rates Stats/Python lovers Vince 	 Walk-though/tutorial, reproducible, reliable Linear regression helps our eyes understand the trends 	 Using GMT for an American account Mismatch between content, style, and the level of analysis 	Linear regression	• None