The student ID of the student whose paper you are grading *

3032130362

Writeup

Readability and grammar of written report (5 points) *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Difficult to read and/or poor grammar	○	○	○	○	◉	Clearly written and excellent grammar

Level of written detail on comparison of R and C++ implementation and runtime (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not write about a comparison of the R and C++ implementation	○	○	○	◉	Wrote a detailed comparison between the R and C++ implementations

R and C++ code

Review the code written by the author. If you aren't sure of the correctness of the implementation, that's fine, just give a grade and say so in the comments.

Correctly coded the parallelization of k-means and pairwise similarity in R/C++ (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
incorrect implementation	○	○	◉	○	seems correct to me

Comments on implementation of parallelization or the similarity measure?

foreach function looks right but the shell file to run the code on the ssh doesn't look right.

Efficiency and practicality of R and C++ code (3 points) *

	1	2	3	
inneficient (e.g. repeated computations unnecessarily, saved objects unnecessarily, etc)	○	◉	○	very efficient and practical

Suggestions for improving *efficiency* of R and/or C++ code *

Could have used matrix operation instead of for loop to do the dot product

Does the author satisfy the following code readability requirements? (3 points) *

- [x] Consistent spacing before and after variable assignment and addition symbols (" = ", " + "), and after commas (", ")
- [ ] No line of code exceeds 80 characters
- [x] Consistent variable naming (words always separated by one of "_" or ".")

Clarity of variable names (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
variable names are unclear and meaningless (eg `df`, `x`, `data2`, etc)	○	◉	○	variable names are helpful and unambiguous

Quality of code comments (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
there are almost no comments	○	○	◉	the comments explain clearly what is being done and why

Suggestions for improving *readability* of R code *

Could have used more meaningful names for the variables instead of something like A, B, M1 and M2

Did the student provide all code necessary for recompiling their results AND report (note: you do not have to actually reproduce their report) (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
Incomplete code or no .Rnw/.Rmd file provided	◉	○	○	Everything was provided

Clarity of folder structure (2 points) *

	0	1	2	
The folder structure was very confusing	○	○	◉	It was clear what each file corresponded to and there were no surplus files floating around

Optional comments on folder structure and files provided (please provide comments if you docked points for any reason)

There was no Rnw or Rmd file

Figures

Correctly produced Ben-Hur-type figures (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not provide a figure like Ben-Hur	○	○	○	◉	Figures look correct

If the Ben-Hur figures do not look correct, what is wrong?

Quality of Ben-Hur Figure 3 replication figures (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not provide a figure like Ben-Hur	○	○	○	◉	Provided clear and visually appealing figures

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

Simple and easy to interpret the figures

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

Nothing much. Figures look great.

Justification of conclusions drawn from the Ben-Hur-type figures (3 points) *

	0	1	2	3	
Did not write about any conclusions drawn from the figures	○	○	◉	○	Clearly outlined interpretations of the figures and drew reasonable conclusions (e.g. found k = 3, or some other value, is the best and provides reasons why)

Comments on the conclusions and interpretations of the Ben-Hur type figures *

Interpretation about the figures is not bad but the numbers on the figures look pretty off. Since we are doing k-means algorithm using samples from the same dataset, I think similarity measure should be closer to 1.

Conclusion

Provide concluding comments

One or more things that you thought was well done overall *

Figures are simple, east to understand

One or more things that could be improved upon overall *

Could have provided Rnw/Rmd file.
Could have provided more reasonable similarity measure results.

Any other comments that you would like to add?

This form was created inside of UC Berkeley.

Google Forms