**Categories taken from the grading rubric**

**1.1 General**

You may have a LaTeX error at the start of section 2 where you define the threshhold of your t-test. Otherwise: no comments

**1.2 Introduction**

Data is introduced clearly. You may consider adding what each data entry looks like (e.g. are they factors, numbers? And what do the values of the predictors mean, what can be considered as “high” or “low” value?)

**1.3 Methods**

I think it is safe to assume people know how PCA works, so you can leave the description of it out. But good that you add the criterium with which you select your principal components. Leaving out the PCA procedure also frees up space that you might want to use for explaining some details of the analysis from (Cilia et al., 2022), which you state to follow.

**1.4 Results**

The results section is well-connected to the methods section (flows naturally), it focuses on the main findings while using appropriate presentation methods (i.e., text / table / figure depending on ease of understanding) with accurate descriptions.

**1.5 Conclusion**

The summary can be excluded / moved to the abstract

**2: no code has been provided (also wasn’t necessary)**

**3 Peer feedback quality**

15 points total

**3.1 General**

2 points

The peer feedback is constructive, concise (no more than a few paragraphs; bullet-points are allowed for small comments) and written in correct English.

**3.2 Summary**

3 points

The peer feedback starts with a well-written paragraph summarizing the project described in the draft report.

**3.3 Main comments**

6 points

The feedback accurately identifies and describes one or a few of the most relevant or pressing issues or shortcomings in the draft report generally, and suggests ways in which this can be improved.

**3.4 Rubric-based feedback**

4 points

With reference to the final grading rubric, the peer feedback systematically provides useful suggestions for improvement in the different sections / planned sections of the draft report.