

## Lab 1 Student grades final

Please provide feedback for the lab 1 you received. The results of this form will be shared with the original author of the report so please provide constructive feedback, for example, "Figure 4 would be clearer if the author increased use of transparency", rather than simply saying things like "Figure 4 was just terrible: I couldn't see anything in that plot!".

Student ID of the student whose paper you are grading \*

3032130362

Name of student \*

Yizhou Zhao

Completeness of report \*

- ☒ Discussed the measurement of interesting variables
- ☒ Discussed data cleaning
- ☐ Provided a graphical critique of the original paper
- ☒ Discussed Finding 1
- ☒ Discussed Finding 2
- ☒ Discussed Finding 3
- ☐ Provided code necessary for recompiling the report (even if you didn't manage to recompile the report)

**Readability of report (5 points) \***

	1	2	3	4	5	
Narrative unclear and/or difficult to read	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Narrative very clear and/or easy to read

**Grammar of report (5 points) \***

	1	2	3	4	5	
Incorrect written grammar pervasive	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Excellent written grammar

**Level of detail on data cleaning and collection (3 points) \***

	1	2	3	
Very little detail (unclear what was done to clean the data)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Very detailed

**Validity of data cleaning (in code or in writeup) (2 points) \***

- ☒ Found that there were two trees
- ☒ Carefully thought about (i.e. discussed in their report) which outliers to remove
- ☐ Noticed that there was an inverse ( $1/x$ ) relationship between the voltage of the network and the log datasets
- ☐ Noticed that the reported dates were weird in one way or another
- ☐ Noticed that the time zones were incorrect
- ☒ Noticed other inconsistencies in the data

### Relevance of figures (excluding findings) in report (4 points) \*

	1	2	3	4	
Low relevance (did not really add anything to the report or were not discussed in the body of the report)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely relevant (each figure added something substantial to the report)

### Quality of figures (excluding findings) in report (4 points) \*

	1	2	3	4	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

### Discuss one or more things that you liked about the figures \*

Nice job playing around with ggplot!

---

### Discuss one or more things that could be improved about the figures \*

The x-axis for figure 2 is unreadable - is this for a single day?

I'd suggest using human-readable labels ("node ID" instead of "as.factor(nodeid)" for the legend).

Figures 4 and 5 suffer majorly from overplotting. Use of transparency would help a lot here. Perhaps choosing a few directions to look at would help for figure 4... there are a few too many colors to visually process.

---

### Graphical critique from the original paper (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Did not have much to say	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Clearly outlined the pros and/or cons of the graphs

### Reproducibility of report (4 points) \*

	1	2	3	4	
Could not recompile the report	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Could recompile the report and got the same output as provided in the original pdf

If you could not recompile the report, or got different output, explain what went wrong

You need to provide a .Rmd or .Rnw file that runs your code and produces your figures. At the very least, you need to at least provide a script that, when run, will automatically reproduce your figures (without requiring human intervention such as manual saving of figures).

Feel free to come chat with me during my office hours if you aren't sure how to do this.

---

### Readability of code (4 points) \*

	1	2	3	4	
Code very difficult to read with little documentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Code easy to read with clear documentation

## Suggestions to improve code (either provide specific examples or general comments) \*

Looking at yizhou\_clean.R

Nice use of piping overall, but you need to improve your consistency.

I'd suggest taking a look at the google R style guide which outlines that there should always be a single space before and after argument assignment in functions (" = "), expressions such as pipes ( %>% ), logical expressions ( > ), ( & ), spaces after commas etc. In addition, no lines of code should exceed 80 characters. Adequate spacing makes code much more readable!

Some more comments would be helpful!

---

## Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 1 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

## Visual quality of figure for Finding 1 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

## Optional comments about Finding 1

You mention Figure 7 but there is no Figure 7.

---

### Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 2 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

### Visual quality of figure for Finding 2 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

### Optional comments about Finding 2

There is no figure provided with this finding!

---

### Creativeness and interestingness of Finding 3 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Not particularly interesting	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely interesting (the finding told you something you didn't know about the lives of redwood trees)

## Visual quality of figure for Finding 3 (3 points)

	1	2	3	
Difficult to understand and visually unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely clear and visually appealing

## Optional comments about Finding 3

Again, no figure is provided

---

## One or more things that you liked about the report overall \*

I'm pleased to see you experimenting with ggplot.

---

## One or more things that could be improved upon \*

I know that English is not your first language, but being able to write with reasonable grammar is extremely important. I understand what you are saying when you write, but there are widespread grammatical errors. I strongly suggest spending some time working on this. I believe that there are many resources available on campus to help non-native speakers with their English writing :)

I suspect that you ran out of time to properly finish the report. Hopefully you get a chance to complete the next one!

---

## Any other comments that you would like to add

You did not quite follow the instructions. You also needed to provide a blinded version of your report (without your name), and you were not supposed to provide the data folder. What is lab\_example.Rnw?

In future, please follow the instructions carefully, or you will risk not having your lab graded as I will be automating the process to look for precisely named files.

---

This form was created inside of UC Berkeley.

Google Forms