

Peer Review of the El Farol Bar Problem

Peer review by group 10, 2018-01-08

David Halldorsson, davh@student.chalmers.se

Evanthia-Gioula Tselepi, tselepi@student.chalmers.se

Johan Larsson Hörkén, horken@student.chalmers.se

Stefan Åström, astrom@chalmers.se

General feedback

- Sections 1 and 2 are really good! Section 3 is hard to follow intuitively and use to replicate your results. Section 4 is a bit hard to interpret. Section 5 doesn't quite contain any discussion. Section 6 is good!
- Check style
 - Be consistent with where to use uppercase. Like 'Reward center'. Maybe consider using *italic*?
 - Missing space after . or () in multiple places
 - Referencing/citations (e.g. in DMU)
 - When making references use capitals, e.g. *Figure* or *Table*
- Check your spelling
- The captions need to be explained further. You should be able to understand a Figure by only reading the caption
- Maybe use more internal references to clarify how different parts of your project are related.

Game description

- Maybe describe the payoff values in proximity to the payoff matrix (Table 1)?

Simulation model

- A bit hard to follow, some sentences need to be rewritten to express your points more clearly. Maybe reference back to Figure 1 to clarify your points, or use e.g. a flowchart to clarify how the parts are related. Think about the order of the Sections
- Agent Brain is used before it is introduced, clarify what it is or forward reference?
- Strategy space and memory size is a bit unclear, please clarify further
- Do not understand Figure 1, need better caption and clarification, what does m and n refer to in the Figure? Make Figure 1 bigger
- The payoffs are first introduced in the STM section, but is referred to earlier. Maybe introduce the STM theory earlier?

- A bit hard to understand *point distribution* in DMU, does it refer to the accumulative score? Maybe make internal reference to clarify how things are related.

Results

- Do not understand the Figures, what is shown on the Y-axis in Figure 3 and 4, what does it mean to have a mixed strategy of e.g. 0.6?
- Consider the format and style of Figure 3 and 4, using the *line chart* is a bit confusing
- How does the results relate to your research questions?

Discussion

- Do not introduce new theory in the Discussion!
- You mention the Nash equilibria, how is that related to your results?
- Discussion section does not really contain any discussion. Try to discuss your own results, the equilibria you found and the strategies you are referring to, and relate to the research questions
- What is Figure 5? Cannot find any reference to it. Also fix scale on X-axis, not possible to see