ES218 Project – Peer review

Make sure to read the following guidelines before proceeding:

* Note that you (as the reviewer) will need to check that all the packages used in the project’s script are installed on your computer. You will know if a package is missing from your computer if the RMD file fails to knit (the error message should be self-explanatory).
* You are all expected to know how to diagnose knitting errors. If errors do present themselves you are to document them in this review. In most cases you should be able to fix them (if I deem a knitting error too difficult to diagnose, I’ll contact the reviewers independently).
* When completed, commit this document to the author’s github repo.

1. Project being reviewed (this is the author name):  
   Reviewer: Jimmy Kieu Reviewee: Henry Toulmin
2. Evaluate each criterion on a score from 1 to 5 (5 being best):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Description | Score  ( 1 to 5 ) |
| Complexity of analysis | * Was the analysis thorough? * Did the nature of the analysis involve complex coding procedures? * Did the author go above and beyond what was expected?  (note that a score of 5 should be assigned judiciously) | 5 |
| Reproducibility | * Was the “knitting” of the Rmd file error free? **(if the knitting process produces an error, 3 points should be automatically deducted)** * Were all warnings and messages suppressed from the output? | 5 |
| Presentation  &  Code quality | * Was the document carefully constructed with properly sized figures? * Were the code chunks clear and properly commented? * Were all loaded packages used as intended by the author? | 4.5 |
| Discussion | * Did the author clearly layout a narrative? * Were the figures and analyses appropriate for what the author was trying to convey? | 5 |

1. Provide thoughtful and constructive feedback. *For example, how could the analysis be improved? Were there errors in the code, if so, what fixes were needed? Are there portions of the script that could have been simplified or re-written in a more succinct way? Did the figures match the narrative? Were there aspects of the analysis that you found novel or unique? Did you learn something new while reviewing the write-up?  
   Make sure to format any code chunks used in your write-up using* ***Courier New*** *font (and maybe change its font color too to distinguish it from the text). Also, indicate the Rmd line number(s) being referenced. You are free to embed snapshots of the html output or Rmd sections via Insert >> Screenshots >> Screen clipping.*

I think the analysis and coding were very good. The introduction established a clear direction for the analysis and the methods used to explore the data were appropriate for the narrative. There were some areas where the plot axes were difficult to read, but, overall, the plots were well presented. The discussion was very thorough and I liked that other sources were cited. I think it would be interesting if you were able to find the sea level data for California and explore the relationship between what you currently have and sea level rise.