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* Abstract, keywords, and reference (5 pts)

Really well written abstract, no issues with this.

5/5

* Introduction (25 pts)

This is really good. One thought is to address some of the statistical challenges in the introduction, foreshadow why you might have to build out complicated models to address spatio-temporal data.

23/25

* Literature Review (25 pts)

Good analysis of literature. I’d like to see a bit more here on contrasting what has previously been done with the approach you will take in your manuscript.
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* Methodology (55 pts)

What you had to do to clean the data probably isn’t necessary to include. You likely had to do a lot of work to get the data into the correct format, but unless it impacts your results you can leave this out of 3.2.

“We initially fitted” should be “We initially fit”

Figure 3 is an effective plot.

Careful being too familiar in your writing. Things like “Now for the covariates” aren’t appropriate for academic writing. Ditto for “Also, please note..” Just say what you are doing. Overall, though, the models are written well.

55/55

* Experimentation and Results (55 pts)

While it’s ok to relegate the table of parameter estimates to the appendix, I would have liked to see some of the key results in the body of the text. You do a good job with the model assessment and selection, but the “so what” of the analysis is really contained in the parameters of the best model. You get to this in the discussion, but I feel it’s better placed in the results section.

55/55

* Discussion and Conclusions including ethical considerations (35 pts)

Good discussion of significance and recommendations here. You *sort of* mention the ethical limitations, but it’d be nice of this was made a bit more explicit. Overall, very well written report.
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