**Group Project Peer Review Template**

UM Stats 506, Fall 2018

Instructions to the reviewer

Please provide 1-3 comments for each of the questions below. It may be helpful to type your answers in blue to help them stand out. If you are unable to assess a given item, please explain why. Feel free to reach out to a member of the group if you have difficulty accessing the overview or examples.

**I. Basics**

1. What is your name and email @umich.edu ?

thgluck@umich.edu

2. Which group are you providing feedback to? What is the topic?

Group 8: Fixed Effects Models

**II. Introduction and Overview**

3. How well is the topic described? Does the group explain why and with what type of data one should use the method/technique given by the topic?

The introduction does an excellent job of describing the topic at hand. They describe the type of data that this topic could be used for and give a classical representation of the topic.

4. What, if anything, did you find confusing about the topic description? Are there any potential errors in what is described?

Did not find anything confusing in the introduction. The only thing I might say to add is what heterogeneity means in relation to the topic at hand.

5. Does the group provide references for the information provided? If so, briefly scan the references to look for any inadvertent plagiarism in the topic description.

The group provides a link to the reference but the link is broken. They have an extra “/” at the end of the url. The introduction should be rewritten, as many of the sentences are taken straight from the Wikipedia page.

6. Is the data adequately described? At a minimum they should provide: a) an overview of the data, b) a link to its source, and c) a brief description of the variables used in the examples.

The data is displayed well with the first 10 rows being displayed and underneath an explanation of what each column variable represents. It also included a brief overview of the data set. There is no link to the source of the data though. Might want to mention where the data was found, and if found in R what package its from.

7. Does the overview contain a brief description of the analysis in the examples and the languages/packages/commands that will be used in each?

The overview does a good job of showing why mixed effects models would be helpful for this data set. But might want to include a brief sentence or two about what languages and packages will be utilized in the tutorial.

8. Please provide 3 concrete suggestions for improving the introduction and overview.

i. Rewrite introduction so it isn’t the same as the Wikipedia page

ii. Provide source for data set

iii. Explain what heterogeneity means in the context of the topic and show where it is found in the graph. (Also fix spelling of heterogeneity on the title of graphs)

9. What did the group do well in this section? Please describe 2-3 strengths of the overview.

i. Displayed the data well

ii. Explained the variables well

iii.

**II. Examples**

Please read at least one example in detail. You may scan the others to look for similarities and differences.

10. Which example(s) did you read in detail?

R and Stata

11. Do the examples process or clean the data in the same way? Are data processing choices explained and or justified?

Yes both examples processed the variables in the same way. The processes are justified to get the value of a dollar in 1983.

12. Do all three examples follow a similar structure and have similar results? If not, what are the main differences you see? In this question, focus on *what is being done* rather than *how it is approached.*

R and Stata reach the same conclusion on the fixed effects models but SAS does not. All three examples do follow the same structure in setting up the model.

13. If there are differences between the examples, have the authors provided and explanation for why? If so, is it clear that the differences cannot be reconciled through more careful application of the chosen tools?

The authors have not included an explanation on why there are differences between the factors of the years between SAS and the other two.

14. Do the examples seem complete? Do they come to some conclusion about the motivating question? If not, suggest a way to summarize the findings.

The examples seem complete, but the summary might want to go a little more in depth about the explanation of the final models. Also might want to explain if there are any downsides in the “Absorption or Not” section to either side.

15. Is the code in the example well commented? Does it follow the style guidelines?

The R code is well commented, but the other two could use more comments. Other than that everything looks good.

16. What did you like best or find most instructive about the examples?

I did like how they showed the difference between doing regular OLS vs. the fixed effects models and how big of a difference they can both lead to.

17. Provide three concrete suggestions on how to improve the examples.

i. Comment the code

ii. Brief explanations of the output

iii. Brief explanations of differences of output from the different packages used within each language

**III. Polish, Navigation, and Appearance**

In this section, the questions ask you to comment on the overall appearance and professionalism of the tutorial.

18. Is it easy to navigate between the introduction and the examples? If not, please provide a suggestion for improvement in this regard.

It was easy to navigate between the introduction and examples.

19. Look specifically at the tables and graphs. Are axes and column/row headers appropriately labeled with words and not, e.g. code\_names?

Graphs and tables looked good with the variable names instead of code. Just need to fix the title spelling in the graphs.

20. Does the tutorial have a polished, professional appearance? Please comment on at least one strength and one weakness in this regard.

Yes the tutorial looks professional and easy to navigate. I like the side bar that allows you to skip from one section to the next. Makes the tutorial look more professional. Biggest thing to work on is the introduction and summary.