

## Lab 1 Peer Review

Student ID (name of folder) of report you are reviewing \*

3032148328

### Completeness \*

- ☒ Discussed the measurement of interesting variables
- ☒ Discussed data cleaning
- ☒ Provided a graphical critique
- ☒ Discussed finding 1
- ☒ Discussed finding 2
- ☒ Discussed finding 3
- ☒ Provided code necessary for compiling report

Reproducibility of report (were you able to reproduce the report? If not, what was the error?) \*

Reproducible, no errors.

---

Readability of code (Did the code follow google style guide? Was it well documented?) \*

Code is generally readable and well-commented. Some line-lengths go over the 80 characters recommended by Google.

---

Readability of report (Was the narrative clear and easy to read? Or did you find it hard to follow?) \*

The report is very well-written and has a clear structure, strong introduction and conclusion, and natural prose.

---

Discuss the data cleaning (Was the cleaning described in detail? Were there any inconsistencies in the data that were missed?) \*

The data cleaning is well-described and thorough. In particular, I commend the author's strategy for outlier rejection.

---

Relevance of figures - excluding findings (Were the figures relevant and discussed in the report?) \*

I thought the figures were very relevant and did a good job of giving an overview of the data and some of its issues. In particular, I especially like the number of readings per day which gives a nice sense of the diminishing data returns. Figure 6 is also very interesting and definitely opens the door for further investigation.

---

Quality of figures - excluding findings (Were the figures easy to understand? Was there a caption? Were the axes labeled? Were they visually appealing? If not, what would you have changed?) \*

In general, the figures are very high-quality. They are visually appealing and I especially like the color scheme (yellow and blue). They are all helpfully captioned and have good axis labels and legends. I do wish that Figure 4 had axis tick labels (i.e. counts on y-axis and dates on the x-axis). Also, Figure 6 switches the color scheme (edge is blue and interior is gold) compared to Figures 3, 4, & 5.

---

Finding 1 (Discuss whether you found the finding interesting. Why or why not?) \*

I think the first finding is interesting, but the author could have presented it in a more interesting way. The author says that PAR data doesn't match up with their intuition given the temperature but does not describe exactly how it doesn't match. Given Figure 6, I would have liked to see more discussion of the PAR data in relation to each tree's temperature.

---

Finding 1, figure quality (Discuss the quality of the figure) \*

The figures are nice looking and well-labeled/captioned. I wish the colors were consistent with the exploratory plots from earlier in the paper.

---

Finding 2 (Discuss whether you found the finding interesting. Why or why not?) \*

The second finding is interesting and shows nicely the differences between the edge and interior tree. It was a good idea to focus in on one hour. The edge tree seems to much more evenly exposed to the sun along its height, which may explain its higher temperature.

---

### Finding 2, figure quality (Discuss the quality of the figure) \*

The figures are nice and go back to the original color scheme. Oddly, the captions of both figures mention variables that are not present in the plots (temperature and humidity rather than incident PAR / reflected PAR). I would also like to know more about the author's choice to use an OLS trendline in Figure 11 but LOESS in Figure 12.

---

### Finding 3 (Discuss whether you found the finding interesting. Why or why not?) \*

I think the conjecture about the position of the edge tree is a bit of stretch, which the author acknowledges. However, the comment on the edge tree's higher directional variability of temperature and humidity further paints the picture of the differences between the two trees.

---

### Finding 3, figure quality (Discuss the quality of the figure) \*

The figures are again professional looking and well-labeled and captioned.

---

### Any additional comments

The figures are again professional looking and well-labeled and captioned.

---

---

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms