1) Remember to put a blank line between your code chunks and any subsequent text.

2) I think it is OK to simply say that the plots indicate outliers, and that you implement filters that remove data with, e.g., z > 20 (or 10 or whatever), without having to show all the tables. It is clear from the histograms alone where you can safely filter data, you need not have to justify the filtering further. (Another way of putting this is that yes, you can make the tables \*off-line\* when you try to decide what values to filter out, but you need not show these tables to the reader. The reader will trust that you did this work; just show the final result.)

3) You didn't show the EDA for price vs. the predictors!

4) See my comment on corrplots in the first email to the class.

A related point: the correlation plot. Including this plot is \*\*fine\*\*, ultimately it only affects inference...meaning that this is informative but that you need not act on the information (since our goal was prediction). In an inferential setting, you'd be hard-pressed to differentiate between (x,y,z), for instance.

5) Don't just do plot(lm.out) unless (a) you know what is being shown, and (b) you can interpret what is being shown for the reader. You can just skip this and go directly to the histogram of the residuals, which as noted in the email to the class should be more focused on the central values. Also, you should have done "our diagnostic," which is predicted test-set prices on the y-axis versus observed test-set prices on the x-axis. This would have indicated (as the first plot(lm.out) plot shows) that there is a systematic trend in residuals that indicates that price probably should be transformed here. You would argue that because we are doing predictions, the transformation is not necessary, and I would reply that yes, it is not necessary, but a log transformation might actually improve your predictions of price. Which it would.

6) What the MSE being higher shows is that the uninformative predictors do not negatively impact predictions. Here, this would suggest that we just keep all the predictors in, particularly as we are not doing inference here.

7) Getting the same result for AIC is not surprising given the sample size...large sample size -> all predictors are important.