Introduction. As you understand it, what is the motivation for this team's report? Does the introduction as written make the motivation easy to understand? Is the analysis well-motivated? Note that we're not necessarily expecting a long introduction. Even a single paragraph is probably enough for most reports.

Group 3 is clear in stating the objective of their report and the mandate the analysis. We would suggest they add in a statement on what the dependent variable is and how that variable relates to measuring crime level.

The Initial EDA. Is the EDA presented in a systematic and transparent way? Did the team notice any anomalous values? Is there a sufficient justification for any data points that are removed? Did the report note any coding features that affect the meaning of variables (e.g. top-coding or bottom-coding)? Can you identify anything the team could do to improve its understanding or treatment of the data?

Group 3 identifies anomalous values, converts factors to numeric vectors (where necessary) and is clear in identification of correlation between predictors. No mention of transformation or removal of anomalous values in this section. The creation of a punishment variable was an interesting interpretation which is likely a better representation of expected value of punishment than the untransformed variables. We would suggest they add in plots to help illustrate some of the bivariate relationships between explanatory variables and the outcome.
Also consider adding univariate plots and summary description of key explanatory variables. This could highlight skewed variables and those that should be transformed before model building.

The Model Building Process. Overall, is each step in the model building process supported by EDA? Is the outcome variable (or variables) appropriate? Did the team consider available variable transformations and select them with an eye towards model plausibility and interpretability? Are transformations used to expose linear relationships in scatterplots? Is there enough explanation in the text to understand the meaning of each visualization?

Group 3 does a good job in supporting each explanatory variable with the appropriate EDA and provides enough reasoning on why each variable was used. The group is clear in evaluating the differences between the performances of each model and explicit in stating the tradeoff between interpretability and accuracy. We suggest that the group provide some explanation on the cross correlation between selected variables and, inspite of this correlation, why the group chooses these variables in their model building.

The Regression Table. Are the model specifications properly chosen to outline the boundary of reasonable choices? Is it easy to find key coefficients in the regression table? Does the text include a discussion of practical significance for key effects?

Group 3 is clear in showing the model coefficients and explaining practical significance for key effects. We suggest adding in how log(explanatory variable) is to be interpreted when assessing the practical effects of a model.

The Omitted Variables Discussion. Did the report miss any important sources of omitted variable bias? For each omitted variable, is there a complete discussion of the direction of bias? Are the estimated directions of bias correct? Does the team consider possible proxy variables, and if so do you find these choices plausible? Is the discussion of omitted variables linked back to the presentation of main results? In other words, does the team adequately re-evaluate their estimated effects in light of the sources of bias?

Group 3 hypothesizes key omitted variables and is clear about how they think the omission of those variables bias the results of their modeling, as well as in what direction those biases appear. We would suggest adding in text on the linking back of the omitted variables to reassess how their estimated effects change in light of the bias.

Conclusion. Does the conclusion address the big-picture concerns that would be at the center of a political campaign? Does it raise interesting points beyond numerical estimates? Does it place relevant context around the results?

We suggest that the group shed some light on the what suggestions they would make to the local government campaign on their modeling results. Tieing in the modeling results to suggestions in the local campaign would serve as a nice wrap up to this stage.