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* Abstract, keywords, and reference (5 pts)

Missing keywords. Part of academic writing is to find 3-4 words/subjects that your paper relates to. Your abstract is written well though and does a good job introducing the reader to your research/findings.

4/5

* Introduction (25 pts)

Interesting background in the introduction. I’d like you to write a bit more here about some of the statistical challenges of modeling this type of data, but this overall pretty good.

23/25

* Literature Review (25 pts)

This section is too sparse. In a literature review you should engage with the literature a bit more. That is, analyze how the authors structured their statistical models. What were their approaches? How does this relate to how you will address the problem?

20/25

* Methodology (55 pts)

Good job discussing some of the challenges of modeling this type of data. One thing to work on is we don’t want to include R scripts in academic writing unless the article is about an R package you built. I like Table 1 but I feel like it’s premature at this point, I would include that in your results rather than in your methodology section.

50/55

* Experimentation and Results (55 pts)

I’m a little confused by your models in Section 4. You mention aggregating by block and by month but your predictor $\eta$ is subscript by both i and j. I also don’t understand why $y\_{ij}$ would have a normal distribution. If it is indeed the number of burglaries in month $i$ and location $j$ I would think it would be Poisson?

In 4.3 you mention a ZIP model, but you don’t have a ZIP model written here. If you’re not going to talk about the results from the Quasi-Poisson and don’t compare it to your other models I don’t know why you are mentioning it here? In general, Section 4 could stand a re-write.

Section 5 is good, but I would like more of a discussion on what the coefficients mean in terms of the statistical question. That would be appropriate here.

40/55

* Discussion and Conclusions including ethical considerations (35 pts)

This section is very well done, especially the stake holder analysis. This was well thought out and presented well.

35/35