ES218 Project – Peer review

1. Author whose project you are evaluating:

Kristen Miller

1. 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) | 4.5 |
| 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 |
| 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.*

Overall this is a very well-constructed paper which moves from one variable to another and include all the necessary information.

Complexity:

This study has included a lot of thoughtful analysis and from qqplot to histograms to loess, the author has used many tools to illustrate her results. The author has also adopted t-test in comparing age between fatal injuries and non-fatal injuries which is also something very helpful for the readers to understand. The index also facilitates the readers from reading.

Reproducibility:

There is no issue when knitting the Rmd file and the author does a great job in its formatting.

Presentation:

The graphs included in this paper is very informative and the only thing that I think the author may consider is adding titles to some of the plots that are missing titles. Though every graph is explained by the paragraph that comes right after it, it may still be important for the graph to have title so the readers can know what it is even without reading the paper.

Discussion:

The logic of the paper follows along smoothly and the author has some important findings which are showcased in a very proper manner in the conclusion.