Peer Feedback

Matthew Distell, Bo Aldridge, Haris Adnan, Lucan Franzblau, Devin Obee

Peer Feedback Team 5-3

This was, through and through, a fantastic research paper. Starting off, there are a few grammatical errors in the first paragraph, with misplaced spaces and commas. Other than that, the premise is laid out clearly, and the motivation is described in depth.

We would say that the justification and motivation for why they conducted this research project was, at times, a little wordy and unnecessary. Since the focus of this project is on the disparities between men and women with regards to their education, it would be more fitting for that to be the focus of the first few sentences in the Introduction. Again, this is not a major flaw, but at times it felt as though the focus wasn't as directed on this aspect as it could have been, which was felt in other parts of the research, such as the visualization section.

One very minor critique is that it was explained where the data came from and why this source was reliable, but a formal citation was not made, and direct links to where the data could be viewed was not shown. This could potentially be helpful for any reader that wanted to investigate their own ideas using similar data sets.

We also particularly liked how organized their explanation regarding their data set selection and join process was held. It was easy to understand for the reader, and intuitive in their code as well.

Speaking of which, their code itself was always intuitive, and the order by which they knitted the document made it very easy to read and understand why they were performing the specific steps they were at those times.

The regression model used complimented the visualizations well. Again, the visualizations were intuitive and well constructed, but unnecessary at times. This is a minor critique.

As for the visualizations and research itself, there was great detail given and intense investigation made. We would venture to say that, at times, some of the graphs were even unnecessary, particularly the ones pertaining to the larger summaries surrounding education trends that did not focus on gender, since those details, while giving more context, detract from the focus of the paper a bit.

The strongest part of the paper was the combination of the summary statistics, visualizations, and linear regression models in the Discussion section. While there were distractions at times, it was apparent from this writing that this team understood various methods of statistical interpretation while having strong explanatory skills to fully elaborate on the greater ideas learned from those different methods of inquiry.

One aspect that could have been improved though was explaining why exactly there specific forms of inquiry were the best for what they chose. While we, as a group, found their forms of statistical inquiry to be rather intuitive and functional, it could also be improved by adding brief summaries as to why what they chose was the all around best method.

The final paragraph itself shows the strength of this project as well. The authors recognize that their work is still ongoing, and point out some of the ways in which their own process could have been improved. Having additional and more refined p-value calculations and regression models would improve the validity of this project, and the authors recognize this as well.

We would venture to say that this first draft is very near complete, seeing as it has a strong null/alternative hypothesis that was clearly explored in great detail. If certain minor details are cleaned up, this would

essentially be a finished product. From the writing to the code, all aspects of this project feel refined, polished, and thoughtful.