Peer review

Milestone 3

During the peer feedback process, you will be provided read-only access to your partner team's GitHub repo. You will provide your feedback in the form of GitHub issues to your partner team's GitHub repo.

Goals

The goals of this milestone are as follows:

- Review others' project drafts as a team and provide feedback
- Post issues on GitHub using an issue template
- Learn from others' projects and improve your own project based on their strengths and weaknesses

Instructions

Part 1

During the first ~ 30 minutes, make progress on your own project.

- Review the feedback from your TA.
- Choose the dataset you want to work with.
- Make progress on your analysis and write-up in index.qmd:
 - At a minimum, write a plan that peers can give feedback on.
 - Time permitting, start the analysis.
- Render the project, commit and push all your changes.

Important

Make sure you always render before you commit and push. If you don't render first, you're going to end up with merge conflicts that are difficult to resolve in auxiliary files created during the render process.

Part 2

Review one other team's project. As a team you should spend ~30 minutes on each team's project.

- Find the names of the teams whose projects you're reviewing below. You should already have access to this team's repo.
- Each team member should go to the repo of the team you're reviewing.
- Then,
 - 1-2 team members clone the team's project and renders it to check for reproducibility.
 - 1-2 team members open the team's project in their browser and starts reading through the project draft.
 - 1 team member opens an issue on the team's repo using the peer review template.
 - All team members discuss the project based on the prompts on the issue template and one team member records the feedback and submits the issue.
- To open an issue in the repo you're reviewing, click on New issue, and click on Get started for the Peer review issue. Fill out this issue, answering the following questions:
 - Peer review by: [NAME OF TEAM DOING THE REVIEW]
 - Names of team members that participated in this review: [FULL NAMES OF TEAM MEMBERS DOING THE REVIEW]
 - Describe the goal of the project.
 - Describe the data used or collected, if any. If the proposal does not include the use
 of a specific dataset, comment on whether the project would be strengthened by
 the inclusion of a dataset.
 - Describe the approaches, tools, and methods that will be used.

- Provide constructive feedback on how the team might be able to improve their project. Make sure your feedback includes at least one comment on the statistical reasoning aspect of the project, but do feel free to comment on aspects beyond the reasoning as well.
- What aspect of this project are you most interested in and would like to see highlighted in the presentation.
- Were you able to reproduce the project by clicking on Render Website once you cloned it? Were there any issues with reproducibility?
- Provide constructive feedback on any issues with file and/or code organization.
- What have you learned from this team's project that you are considering implementing in your own project?
- (Optional) Any further comments or feedback?

Review pairings

L1 - 8:30 am

Lab section	Your team name	Team to review
1	muds_199	tmnt
1	tmnt	quant_queens
1	$quant_queens$	c_plus_plus
1	c_plus_plus	$data_alch$
1	$data_alch$	$data_dream_team$
1	$data_dream_team$	git _up
1	git _up	outliers
1	outliers	green_beans
1	green_beans	muds_199

L2 - 10:05 am

Lab section	Your team name	Team to review
2	team_G	iguanas
2	iguanas	B_team
2	B_team	$team_J$
2	$team_J$	DATA
2	DATA	cool coders

2	$\operatorname{cool}\operatorname{_coders}$	the_A_team
2	the_A_team	$data_devils$
2	$data_devils$	$team_D$
2	$team_D$	tibble
2	tibble	$team_G$

L3 - 11:45 am

Lab section	Your team name	Team to review
3	team_3g	maat
3	maat	ddes
3	ddes	read
3	read	$team_tibble$
3	$team_tibble$	$women_in_premed$
3	$women_in_premed$	$data_wranglers$
3	$data_wranglers$	angry_nerds
3	$angry_nerds$	team_e
3	$team_e$	$\operatorname{git_dubs}$
3	$\operatorname{git_dubs}$	$team_3g$

L4 - 1:25 pm

Lab section	Your team name	Team to review
4	the_ctrl_freaks	leopards
4	leopards	$team_4d$
4	$team_4d$	$green_team$
4	$green_team$	$team_slice$
4	$team_slice$	the_data_divas
4	the_data_divas	$the_byte_brigade$
4	$the_byte_brigade$	the_ctrl_freaks

L11 - 1:25 pm

Lab section	Your team name	Team to review
11	$rated_r$	team_walle
11	$team_walle$	$standard_deviants$
11	$standard_deviants$	$the_outliers$

11	$the_outliers$	geom_cool
11	$geom_cool$	$team_ice_spice$
11	$team_ice_spice$	$hundredth_percentile$
11	$hundredth_percentile$	$the_meanies$
11	$the_meanies$	data_wizards
11	$data_wizards$	$algorithm_alchemists$
11	$algorithm_alchemists$	$rated_r$

L5 - 3:05 pm

Lab section	Your team name	Team to review
5	mean_team	nan_of_ur_business
5	$nan_of_ur_business$	$inside_investigators$
5	$inside_investigators$	$smaRt_water$
5	$smaRt_water$	acee
5	acee	mines_minions
5	mines_minions	$tidyverse_tibbles$
5	$tidyverse_tibbles$	$mean_team$

L6 - 4:40 pm

Lab section	Your team name	Team to review
6	bumblebees	jelms
6	jelms	$standard_deviations$
6	$standard_deviations$	$mines_data_miners$
6	$mines_data_miners$	$geom_duke$
6	$geom_duke$	ggplotters
6	ggplotters	$team_beach$
6	team_beach	bumblebees

L7 - 4:40 pm

Lab section	Your team name	Team to review
7	data_dinos	we_r
7	we_r	the_moose
7	the_moose	$mines_fanclub$
7	$mines_fanclub$	$stat_squad$

7	$stat_squad$	$spelling_bees$
7	$spelling_bees$	$stat_ninjas$
7	$stat_ninjas$	$ital_is_vital$
7	$ital_is_vital$	$data_dinos$

Grading

Peer reviews will be graded on the extent to which it comprehensively and constructively addresses the components of the reviewee's team's report.

Only the team members participating in the review during the lab session are eligible for points for the peer review. If you're unable to make it to lab in person, you should arrange to virtually connect with your team during your lab session.

• 0 points: No peer review

• 1 point: Feedback provided is not constructive or actionable

• 2-4 points: Feedback provided is not sufficiently thorough

• 5 points: Peer review is constructive, actionable, and sufficiently thorough

Note

The feedback issue will come from one team member on GitHub since you can't collectively edit an issue. However it must represent the opinions of the entire team. It is not a single team member's responsibility to provide feedback, they're just the record keeper for the team.