MSc/PG Diploma in Statistical Science
PRACTICAL FEEDBACK FORM

Student Name: P648
Practical Title:

[Tick one box for each of 1-6. The middle box corresponds to satisfactory work (and boxes to the right/left indicate stronger/weaker work).]

1. Writing Style	Unclear, difficult to read				x		Clear, flowing, easy to read
2. Statistical Analysis	Weak, invalid			x			Strong, valid
3. Answering the report question	Aspects of the question ignored				x		Question answered in full
4. Conclusions	No observations			x			Limitations of current analysis clearly brought out
5. Figures and Tables	No statistical meaning, wrong size, missing labels or captions				x		Meaningful, correct size, good labels and captions
6. R Code	Missing R code, inconsistencies				x		Well presented and correct R code

Overall Assessment: Pass

Individual Feedback:

P648

Some exploratory plots are good, and it was a good idea to account for distance in Fig 1. However, the middle plot is misleading I think: for a given stroke, short course times are always less than long course times - so the mid top row plot isn't really a good thing to plot here.

Sec 2: I don't think you spot the increasing variance with distance, which is an important thing here.

Early Sec 3: I think you mean raising time (rather than dist) to some power less than 1?

I think you need to give some more details in your report:

I expected the parameter estimates for your preferred model to be in the report,

I expected standard errors of parameter estimates (or conf intervals) to be in the report,

Perhaps also at least some numerical details about the model fitting/selection process.

I like your discussion in 4.5.

Using notation like: time ~ (dist + sex + course + stroke)^2 would be fine, perhaps simpler/quicker to read than the math notation you use?

It seems very unusual to use both Box Cox to get to time^0.9 and also then afterwards use weighted regression. If Box Cox is suggesting lambda=0.9, taking lambda=1, especially if you are wanting to then weight, seems ok to me. Lambda=1 also leads to straightforward interpretations whereas 0.9 does not.

Interpretation: good to see you've been careful, but the reader needs your results for these sections or to be able to look at other interpretations.

The text in some figures is a bit too small, e.g. Fig 5.

Predictions: all of B,C,D involve extrapolation to some extent, and C & D are especially questionable.