Criteria	Points possible	Points earned
Writing		
Abstract	5	5
Introduction	5	5
Methods	5	5
Results	5	5
Discussion	5	5
References	5	5
Code		
Document is fully reproducible	25	20
Demonstrate use of inline code	5	0
At least two data visualizations	10 (5 pts each)	
Demonstrate tidying messy data using:		
gather()	5	3
separate()	5	3
<pre>select(), and filter()</pre>	5	5
spread()	5	3
At least one table of descriptive statistics	10	5
group_by()	5	2
summarize()	5	2
Total	110	83

• I removed 5 points from reproducibility because (a) when I knit the file the figures did not render as you have them, and one of them was cutoff nearly entirely, and (b) although you loaded the {here} library, you did not use the here function, which reduces the likelihood of reproducibility across machines. Admittedly, this second one is a minor point when you're using a

GitHub repo, but it's still something we covered throughout the term and I do think is helpful.

- I removed an additional five points from the data visualizations because (a) they were largely created not from code covered in the class (at least in the document), but also (b) they were all placed in the same chunk and therefore not able to have separate captions. I separated them out.
- I removed 5 points from "Demonstrate use of inline code" because I did not see any inline code in the document.
- I removed 2 points from each of `gather`, `separate`, and `spread`, because although you used them, I know that the code originated from code I wrote for you in class and there was very little expansion on that code. More than that, however, I was a little disappointed there wasn't more use of tidyverse code throughout the document.
- I removed 5 points from "At least one table of descriptive statistics" because your table is not descriptive, it is just your raw data, and it is not in APA format, which could have been achieved by using the 'apa\_table' function from within {papaja}.
- I removed three points from each of `group\_by` and `summarize` and I was tempted to remove all of them because of the use of `plyr::ddply`. I noted in prior feedback not to use this, and noted reasons why, and I noted it again in your presentation feedback. It was also mentioned by at least one of your peer-reviewers, but was never changed. This code is not necessary with the more modern tidyverse code, and should not be used, as the functions conflict with many of those in the tidyverse.