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Reference 1 - 0.01% Coverage

Feeling a bit ashamed now:)

Reference 2 - 0.02% Coverage

I definitely disliked the gender stacking -- my suggestion/improvement included showing each gender separately in different graphs.

Reference 3 - 0.06% Coverage

Unfortunately I could not find reliable figures for cancer disease in Africa to make a broader comparison, but I believe there are other aspects related to meat production, like chemicals usage, quality of water, etc, that may have an impact on cancer disease;

Reference 4 - 0.01% Coverage

And so sad the same time.

Reference 5 - 0.01% Coverage

The way the trend is on your chart, I am afraid this outlier value may eventually not be so far off the chart...

Reference 6 - 0.02% Coverage

Unfortunately i am not able to read any of the annotations or the legend.

Reference 7 - 0.05% Coverage

I was also confused by the content, and when looking at the graphic and not certain what story is being told.

Reference 8 - 0.02% Coverage

t’s a shame the available data doesn’t tell a more geographical storysomething along the lines of developing and emerging economies are mostly located in a band on either side of the equator.

Reference 9 - 0.06% Coverage

Sorry for chiming in late, but also just wanted to mention, if we could look how the total amount of annual aid has an impact - because at first glance it seems that smaller countries may give more per capita because there is some minimal amount (that they may feel obliged to give, or had promised

Reference 10 - 0.02% Coverage

Sorry David, sent too soon! :)

Reference 11 - 0.02% Coverage

Unfortunately, due to resolution of your plot, I can not clearly see it on my screen...

Reference 12 - 0.01% Coverage

Unfortunately, the FFA does not indicate what the data relates to (paid for a performance, went to a performance).

Reference 13 - 0.01% Coverage

Sorry these are very brief/rushed comments, as I’ve already written up my comments to some other people (and run out of time)

Reference 14 - 0.02% Coverage

I was a bit puzzled how the high numbers were much lower if the data set was limited to the time frame after the expansion of numbers occurred.