

Produce a professionally formatted Jupyter Notebook that shows an experimental workflow to generate evidence for the Disputed Federalist Papers.

Submit

- (1) a README.txt, [no, some, yes, ++] _____
(2) a Jupyter Notebook

Writing

- Markdown notebook looks professional [no, some, yes, ++] _____
Summary sets the context [no, some, yes, ++] _____
Mention/cite Jockers and Witten's 2010 paper; [no, some, yes, ++] _____
mention *their* results on the disputed papers [no, some, yes, ++] _____
References included [no, some, yes, ++] _____

Methods (when you run different techniques, you may need to change details for each run)

- Mention starting data set (e.g., 1- or 2-grams, from *Lexos*) [no, some, yes, ++] _____
(You need to explain where the data came from,
and how tokenized)

Detecting “bad data”

- missing features (column values); any change to words used? [no, some, yes, ++] _____
- Provide an argument why for removing any outliers or not. [no, some, yes, ++] _____

- Discuss cluster and/or classification algorithms applied [no, some, yes, ++] _____

Results

Generate Results and discuss evidence for the authorship of disputed papers:

- (a) a clustering technique [no, some, yes, ++] _____
(b) a classification technique [no, some, yes, ++] _____
(c) an additional classification technique [no, some, yes, ++] _____

For each category, the assessment rank of [no, some, yes, ++] will indicate the following associated level of completion:

<u>Level of completion</u>	<u>Effort</u>
No:	None
Some:	Average
Yes:	Above average
++:	Superior