

Your information



Peer review

Student ID of the report you are reviewing *

3033134639

Was the report reproducible? If not what was the error? *

No. Report uses a very new package "ggpomological" to generate plots. I'm using R3.4.3, which does not recognise this package.

Suggestions to improve code *

More code. This report has very little code.

Comments on readability and grammar of the report. If there are issues any specific suggestion on what can be improved? *

Largely readable.

Discuss one (or more) things that you liked about the author's kernel density estimation figures *

Colour schemes for densities are great and axes font colours are chosen well.

Discuss one (or more) things that could be improved for the author's kernel density estimation figures *

(1) Show densities for different kernel choices. (2) Shrink figure sizes to take up less space.

Discuss one (or more) things that you liked about the author's loess figures *

Colour schemes for densities are great and axes font colours are chosen well.

Discuss one (or more) things that could be improved for the author's loess figures *

(1) Show loess fits for different choices of polynomial degrees and bandwidths. (2) Shrink figure sizes to take up less space.

Discuss the author's comparison of the two questions. Is there something you would have done differently?

Even though the analysis is prefaced by a fascinating anecdote and is substantial in terms of correlation with geography, it is incomplete. I was hoping to see a discussion about correlation between responses to Q70 and Q68.

Discuss one (or more) things that you liked about the author's figure(s) for the comparison *

Titles and subtitles are informative, and the "ggpomological" background colour makes the entire figure look aesthetically pleasing.

Discuss one (or more) things that could be improved for the author's figure(s) for the comparison *

-

Optional comment on cluster analysis

Cluster analysis is incomplete (no dimension reduction).

Discuss one (or more) things that you liked about the author's clustering figure(s) *

Titles and subtitles are informative, and the "ggpomological" background colour makes the entire figure look aesthetically pleasing.

Discuss one (or more) things that could be improved for the author's clustering figure(s) *

(1) May want to use gg_tile rather than plot points, but this may be up to personal preference.

Optional comments of the stability analysis

Stability analysis is incomplete.

Google Forms