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: -Vey little textual description in 2.b). All in all I am missing some better textual descriptions.

+ Describes the outcome nicely

Code quality: - Not so many filling comments in the code, relays more on the markdowns for that. Few comments become a problem in 2.b) where thay have used beautiful soup and no comments on how it works. Why convert to geojson when topojson has work for all other tasks, task 3.b), and not justify it?

+ Uses the features of the library, but there are still some hardcoding of features e.g. task 2.a) and b). Small and fairly readable cells.

Results: - Missing y-values on the last plot in 1.c). Should keep to one solution and not two, 3.b).

+ Good results, but are the results in 1.c) correct. Short and concise -> very good notebook.

The review:

For all the tasks you describe the result in an easy and understanding way, this shows that you have understood what you are doing and used the libraries for their potential. What I am missing is a more textual description of why and how you were planning to get the result you wanted. More textual descriptions before and during each task would really have helped on the readability of the notebook and made it easier for potential reader to get to know your thought on the problems you solved and how you solved them.

The code could also have been better commented as there where some parts of it, mainly task 2. a) and b), where there were some large cells with a lot of hardcoded dataframe handling in them. This would also have helped on the readability of the code and could also been done with more of the built-in functionality of Pandas. You have used BeautifulSoup and here is it especially important to describe how it works and what you do with it as it was not a library that was supposed to be used in this exercise.

The different maps created trough out the exercise looks very good and communicates the results you have obtained in a good way to the reader. Clear separation between the different sides of the colourmap. One thing that I am wondering about is why you would want to use a geojson instead of a topojson in task 3. B) when you have used topojson for the rest? Is it for the sliders? Should have had a justification for this.

Could have just used one of the solutions for task 3. B), but I see that it could have been hard to choose between them as they both relayed you results in a very nice way.

I’m also missing the y-values for the last plot in task 1. C), but all in all this was a good notebook.

Grades:

Textual description: 4.5

Code quality: 5

Results: 5.5