**Math 150: Evaluation of Final Survival Analysis Project**

**Group Members:**

**1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**­**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |
| **Introduction**   1. Brief background. Has an explanation been given for why the research was done? Why is the work important? What is its relevance? Does the background and significance have a logical organization? Does it move from the general to the specific? (0-4) 2. Objective or research question. Is the brief description of the hypothesis / goals and findings of the paper clearly stated for the reader. Is the final paragraph of the introduction a brief description of the hypothesis/goals of the paper? (0-4) | **8** | \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
| **Methods (your methods, not the methods of the original authors)**   1. Variables: are the explanatory and response variables described? What are the levels and definitions (e.g., units) of the variables? Were any of the variables transformed or wrangled? (0-3) 2. Missing data: what is the extent of the missing data? What did you do about it? Could it bias your results? (0-2) 3. New method:  * Is enough background information / referencing given so that the source of the new knowledge is recognized? (0-2) * Is the new topic sufficiently described to demonstrate an understanding of the topic? (0-8)  1. Statistical methods: Are the methods motivated by the research question and the background analysis? Are the methods appropriate and logical? (0-5) | **20** | \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
| **Results**   1. Are the variables summarized, explained, graphically depicted? Are the demographic variables balanced across the treatment groups (as would be expected for a randomized experiment)? (0-5) 2. Are the results of interest explained, summarized, graphically depicted? What do the results say about the research question of interest? Are the results appropriate, logical, and accurate? (0-10) 3. Is each model / summary output completely described (no naked tables anywhere), including table captions? (0-3) 4. Is each figure completely described (no naked figures anywhere), including figure captions? (0-3) 5. Is there evidence of assessment of the technical conditions throughout the paper? (0-4) 6. Is the new topic explicitly connected to the project and the context of the data / analysis? (0-5) 7. To whom can the results be generalized (or not)? What is the relevant population being investigated? (0-3) | **33** | \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
| **Discussion/Conclusions**   1. Restatement of objectives of study (questions) and the results of the study (results) (0-2). 2. Does the author clearly state whether the results answer the question (support or disprove the hypothesis)? (0-3) 3. Were specific data / analyses / figures cited from the results to support each research question interpretation?  Does the author clearly articulate the basis for supporting or rejecting each hypothesis as well state limitations of results? (0-3) | **8** | \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
| **Coverage / Clarity**   1. Descriptive and appropriate title (0-1) 2. Is the presentation organized, with labeled sections, and a generally well-written paper? (0-4) 3. Has the paper been edited without excessive grammar or spelling errors? (0-2) 4. Is the work completely reproducible such that the instructor is able to run the .qmd file with no additional edits? (0-4) 5. Are both a qmd and a pdf version of the assignment turned in? (0-2) 6. Is there no code in the compiled pdf of the assignment, but the code to analyze the data is clear in the qmd version of the assignment? (0-4) 7. Is a final model specified for “best model” competition that will use the c-index? (0-1)   8. References: (0-3)   * Does each reference have full information, not just the URL? * Is the formatting consistent across references and in-line citations?   9. Possible bonus points from graphic or model competition. | **21** | \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
| **Total Points** | **90** |  |  |

**General Comments**