Textual description: Did the team include a textual description of their solution? Is it understandable? Is the described process correct?

Code quality: Is the code readable and concise? Does it use the powerful features of the libraries, or does it re-implement everything from scratch?

Results: Is the final result correct? Are all the assumptions well justified? Are there textual comments/visualizations to convince you of the final result?

Textual description: + The descriptions are detailed and makes for easy understanding of how it was done and the results, but it all comes in the end of the task. Description of how it was done, and result should be separated and how should be on the top of a cell and as comments during code while results should be below a cell.

* Describes what is done short, but maybe too short. Task 1 doesn’t describe why they clean the data as they do. No clear separation between subtasks, ref A3, does make my job take longer.

Code quality: + Uses the features of the library. Good comment in the code and a lot of them.

* Cells could have been split up more. For task B there is less comment in the code, inconsistency.

Results: +

* Same as last group; negative years to positive and remove last digit from years of 5 digits and they give no reason for this. Doesn’t give us the results that leads up to the different ways they clean their data. Only a description after the cell. If they had plotted the colour of each bar in the A3.3 they would have seen that the Unknown colour was a shade of blue. Misunderstod how to use Categorical in task B. Missed a lot of redundant columns in task B.

Actual review:

For task A there are good descriptions of what was done to achieve each result, and some comments in the code for the larger cells. Task B on the other hand contains no comment on the code or textual description of what each cell does to achieve the results or conclusion. Also, some cells are very large and with no description of what is happening it’s makes it harder to understand the code, and it doesn’t help that it’s very hard to see the separation between subtask in A3 and B3, but from what I can see the features of the library is well used and used in the correct situations.

Even though the descriptions from task A makes me understand how they managed to get to the result, all of it is put in the end of each task. How things are done in each cell should accompany that cell and not be pushed down in the end of the subtask together with the result and conclusion.

Should have take more care about the data cleaning. In task B, there where more redundant columns that could have been removed and the choice to make Bike ID and starting- and ending station categorical is questionable. In task A, the choice of changing negative years to positive and removing the last digit in years with 5 digits is explained, but still a choice that could have corrupted the data even more. But all in all, the results they achieve are reasonable and the visualizations make them clearer.

Grades:

Textual description: 4,5

Code quality: 5

Results: 5