Peer Review – Sifeng Li

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TitleClear, Interesting, Focused | The title is focusedMaybe explain what CDI is, as the readers are not aware of the dataset when first reading the title | 5 pts |
| Author/Contact InfoYour name and email addr. |  | 0 pts |
| AbstractSummarizes I,D,M,R,D in 3-6 brief clear sentences. | The abstract perfectly summarizes all sections. Maybe the results section could be more concise | 5 pts |
| IntroductionBrief, clear, to the point; context for the problem; What is the problem/aim of the study? What questions will be answered? | The fourth research question – would missing information be a cause for concern – should also be presented  | 10 pts |
| DataHow was the data generated? By whom? Variable definitions, sample size, quick numerical summaries of the variables and initial EDA. Don't forget to add some sentences/paragraphs explaining everything! | Nothing more to improve on | 5 pts |
| MethodsList the methods and/or analysesthat will be used to answer each question stated in the Introduction. No dataanalysis, graphing, model fitting, etc. appears here | Nothing more to improve on | 5 pts |
| ResultsStatistical analysis & results in order parallel to Intro & Methods; no new methods or data; no big picture discussion | I love how this section is divided into sub-sections for clearer presentation.I think maybe some of the R codes and R output could be put into the appendix e.g. table 6 could be reported in words or in a table, and codes can be described by words | 10 pts |
| DiscussionRecap findings; address main problem/question; strengths & weaknesses; implications, unanswered questions, future research | All findings presented earlier are revisited and concluded. All research questions are answered. Limitations of the dataset are addressed. Maybe address a few limitations on the model itself.  | 10 pts |
| MechanicsFollows C-C-C as much as possible (sentences, paragraphs & sections); Grammatical; Easy to follow | Writing is fluent and grammatically correctParagraphs in Discussion section is a little bit long. Maybe we could shorten them and make them more concise.  | 5 pts |
| Statistical ContentCorrectly and appropriately uses technical and non-technical material we have learned in class. Easy to follow; Analysis makes sense/not crazy (roughly 10% per research question) | Nothing more to improve on | 40 pts |
| References & CitationsFollow ASA guide, “The Reference List” & “Reference Citations” (be sure to cite all sources!) | Nothing more to improve on | 5 pts |
| Technical AppendixHelps me to understand your paper and give you max points above; Easy to follow. Complete analyses: R code, output, graphs, tables, and comments explaining what you did and why. | Nothing more to improve on  |  |