Jake Newman
Mr. Ulle
STS 98
HCMST Report (Peer Review)

Overall, great report Mujia! First of all, I really liked how you introduced the data and clearly explained your findings. Secondly, in reporting the example variables, I appreciated your being very specific and thorough. If I were not already familiar with the data, I would have found this section very helpful in quickly getting oriented. Also, in responding to each question, the way you clearly stated your findings / interpretations upfront, then going into the specific analysis that led you there was great. This proved to be a very effective choice in writing the report, one that I wish I had utilized more concretely in my own writeup. It really helps to contextualize the analysis and give the reader more insight into your thought process. Also, it helps to maintain the reader's attention and focus, especially in such a large report. Only a few small things stood out as areas for possible improvement, but keep in mind that overall this is already a great report. For example, In the first sentence, there's a small error ("Meed" vs "Meet") in the title of the dataset, which I'm assuming was probably a typo. Otherwise, you have a strong introduction that frames the report very well. Also, as a general comment, I'd suggest, in certain cases, that you explore plotting proportions instead of raw counts, as that may lead you to draw different conclusions than what the raw counts alone seem to suggest. Nevertheless, to a large extent, this is a matter of preference and there is nothing inherently wrong with simply plotting raw counts. My last suggestion would've been to perhaps consider including relevant plots in your discussion of the self-proposed question, as I think having few could have added to the strength of those sections. On a lighter note, your age comparison graph is phenomenal, very apt, and does a great job of communicating your analysis. The stacked density plot is extremely effective, much better than my own approach to this question.