

TA Feedback (Nicole): There is quite a bit of text on your poster. You are very clear in your explanations, but if you can streamline the text you can make your bottom figures a bit larger. You use EQ for earthquake in a few places, but it might be helpful to explicitly state that shorthand. You might want to remove the maximum likelihood function from your poster and instead explain what your priors are in words.

Peer Feedback:

Project 26:

- Strengths: Clearly explains concepts related to the poster; correlation with heat flow is neat!
- Weaknesses: Unclear why it is exactly important to constrain the Omori-Utsu law parameters—yes because it might be correlated with heat flow, but what does that mean for understanding Earth dynamics?; Color palette is a bit busy (white, black, blue, red, orange, and green).

Project 26

- See if you can make your equations and figures not have the white outline. It looks a little out of place.
- There is a very nice flow to the graph. It is very followable.
- I like the bright titles they draw attention to themselves and bring out the poster.
- The break between different sections is irregular. I would try to more evenly space them out.

Project 26: Aftershocks decay fitting with MCMC ensemble sampling: Omori-Utsu decay constant and heat flow relation?

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Nice poster design!- The explanatory text in figure 3 is really helpful for understanding the figure- The explanation of the method in the paper is very thorough, great job. I also think you did a good job including only the important details on the poster which makes it more readable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The conclusion feels a little vague/I don't fully understand what the MCMC analysis tells you (or why it's worth doing). What is interesting about being able to use this method? What can you learn from the aftershocks decay parameters? Are there specific conclusions that can be drawn (e.g. about heat flow?) from the results of the MCMC analysis?- There are a few typo's throughout, so just keep an eye out for those!

26	<p>Strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly a lot of effort was spent on plotting, I especially like the heat flow vs p-value graph, which has margins as well. Very colorful, very nice. I like how Omori-utsu law was front and center in the intro section, this allowed me to quickly realize what the equation you're fitting looks like. 	<p>Weakness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I had to spend quite some time looking for the results, since their location was not entirely clear to me. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put the results front and center The MCMC ensemble sampling process contains details such as burn in which isn't necessary for a poster. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would consider removing it.
----	--	---

Feedback from Prof. Knutson:

This is a very nice analysis, and I have only very minor suggestions.

— In the fit to the Loma Prieta data, would it make sense to mask the earliest points in the fit if the model doesn't have the ability to fit them? I wonder if including them might bias the overall fit parameters.

— Along the same lines for the Prague event your model appears to lie systematically below much of the data. I understand the numbers are small but it doesn't seem like the model is doing a good job fitting the data here. I also have the same question about masking early data.

— I think you can leave the corner plot off the poster, which will help streamline things a bit. In your plot of p value versus heat flow, should there be error bars on the heat flow values or is this something that is known with absolute precision? It might be nice to make the plot a bit taller/make the points smaller so we can see the error bars more easily. They seem to be quite tiny for your fits (and indeed, also for some of the previous studies).