

The goals of peer review are 1) to help improve your classmate's paper by pointing out strengths and weaknesses that may not be apparent to the author, and 2) to help improve your own editing skills.

*Instructions:* Read the papers assigned to you twice, once to get an overview of the paper, and a second time to provide constructive criticism for the author to use when revising his/her paper. Answer the questions below. Please submit separate pdf documents of your responses to the questions below for each DAR you evaluate. Use a naming convention with the DAR paper number, for example DAR123.pdf.

### *Organization*

1. Were the basic sections (Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusion) adequate? If not, what is missing?
  - a. It was all there. Good work on adding a diagnostics section.
2. Was the material ordered in a way that was logical, clear, and easy to follow?
  - a. yes
3. Could the clarity or efficiency be improved by changes in the order of the paper? Are there portions of the text that could be omitted?
  - a. Should explain what each of the covariates are.

### *Grammar and Style*

4. Were there any grammatical or spelling problems?
  - a. No.
5. Was the writer's writing style clear? Were the paragraphs and sentences cohesive and logically explicated? Briefly provide specific examples for your response.
  - a. Avoid the first person. No 'we' and 'us'.
  - b. At times, the sections got lengthy or sometimes it seemed to move really fast.
  - c. The entire paper felt like a conversation. Did the author want that?

### *Content:*

"Explain" may be interpreted as "What is missing?" and "What could be deleted?" and "What is accomplished well?"

6. Did the writer adequately state the problem and place it into context? Explain.
  - a. Explained the problem. Good work on not just restating the abstract in the intro and vice versa.
7. Did the writer successfully use tables and figures to clarify the exposition and forward the story line? Were figures or tables improperly/incompletely labeled or captioned, or not appropriately cited/interpreted in the text? Be specific.
  - a. Good use of bolding in all tables especially table 2.

- b. Nice captions.
- 8. Were model choices well justified? Were the inferences drawn appropriate from the chosen model? Explain.
  - a. Good choice in model
  - b. For the predictions, are those probabilities or odds?
- 9. Did the writer adequately interpret inferences and accurately summarize results? Explain.
  - a. Why the switch from odds ratio to probabilities?
  - b. There was a lot of 'fluff' in the inferences. Was it needed?
- 10. Does the abstract *concisely and clearly* summarize the whole data analysis project, including the findings? What could be added or deleted?
  - a. Did you explain why dre, psa, and gleason was combined into a single measure of risk instead of looking at them individually?

*Overall summary:*

- 11. Which part of the paper is the most effective? *Why?*
  - a. EDA, modeling, and diagnostics. It was what the readers really wanted to know with all the facts.
  - b. Good job on linking the git repository.
- 12. Which part of the paper is the least effective? *Why?*
  - a. *Introduction. It feels like it's lacking something.*
  - b. *The inference seemed like there was some rambling at the end.*
  - c. *No more first person.*