

Reproducibility of report (were you able to reproduce the report? If not, what was the error?) *
Yes.
Readability of code (Did the code follow google style guide? Was it well documented?) *
Yes.
Readability of report (Was the narrative clear and easy to read? Or did you find it hard to follow?) *
Yes. Easy to follow

Discuss the data cleaning (Was the cleaning described in detail? Were there any inconsistencies in the data that were missed?) *

The data cleaning part of the report was describes in detail. The author elaborated why he did each step, which is very clear. I think it would be better if the author can think more about the data cleaning besides only missing value and outliers.

Relevance of figures - excluding findings (Were the figures relevant and discussed in the report?) *

Yes. I pretty like the data exploration part of this report. The author explored the humidity using histogram and also represent both edge and interior density of humidity. For the exploration part of the relationship between different variables. The relationship between temperature and humidity makes sense, but I don't think the relationship between height and humidity tell us a lot information, so I think this figure shouldn't be included in the report. Just from my opinion.

Quality of figures - excluding findings (Were the figures easy to understand? Was there a caption? Were the axes labeled? Were they visually appealing? If not, what would you have changed?) *

Easy to understand, no caption, axes labeled. The edge and interior density of humidity plot is appealing.

Finding 1 (Discuss whether you found the finding interesting. Why or why not?) *

Yes. Actually I did exactly the same plot for humidity not relative humidity for the first plot. It shows how humidity changes with different days, which indicates different weather.

Finding 1, figure quality (Discuss the quality of the figure) *

Good. No problem with it

Finding 2 (Discuss whether you found the finding interesting. Why or why not?) *

Yes. A lot of people has done the relationship between humidity and temperature. But the author color the dots with different heights, which is more interesting than others.

Finding 2, figure quality (Discuss the quality of the figure) *

Good. The colors used are comfortable for me

Finding	3 (Discuss	s whether yo	ou found	I the fir	nding into	eresting.	Why o	why
not?) *								

Not sure about it. I think at lower overall humidity, splitting the edge and interior is better than not doing it. But it doesn't tell a lot information. And I don't think it is really valuable to present the weak relationship between humidity and temperature at lower humidity

Finding 3	, figure	quality	(Discuss	the	quality	of the	figure) *
-----------	----------	---------	----------	-----	---------	--------	-----------

good. Like the color

Any additional comments

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms