Emily:

Title:

* Clear, discusses exactly what will be talked about
* Could be more eye-catching or interesting

Author info

* Both name and email are there
* I think it would look better centered, but that’s just me

Abstract

* could mention the 4 specific research questions very briefly or at least a bit more detail into what the analysis focuses on (e.g. specific attention to crime)
* Really concise and tells the reader exactly how the paper shapes up; no unnecessary wording

Introduction

* felt too brief; could probably elaborate a bit more on the specifics of each question
* Really easy to understand

Data:

* its unclear what you mean when you say best predictors, be a bit more specific on the relationships between all the variables. I think if you organize that paragraph to stress which variables with a positive linear relationship as opposed to a negative or nonlinear relationship it would be easy to follow.
* No unnecessary plots; keeps the reader engaged and not distracted.

Methods:

* I don't think you need to mention the specific packages or functions you used
* Clearly outlines all statistical analyses that you used and in what order, as well as the motivation for all of them

Results:

* what do you mean when you say including interaction makes a difference for the second question?
I think a summary and interpretation of a few coefficients would be good to show what vars are meaningful
You talk about how much data is missing but not about whether or not it matters (I think that more exploration on this should be in results, not discussion, but I could be wrong)
I don’t think the equations are necessary, seem too technical
* Again, your writing is really clear and easy to follow

Discussion:

* you could be more specific about how exactly it's an issue if there aren't all these counties, e.g. the ones not included have lower populations so they're inherently different in predictor values which could make our model perform worse on them or something like that
* Really good future work section

Mechanics:

* Clear sentence structure; easy to follow
* Sometimes seems too informal

Statistical Content:

* Meaningful analysis and visualization; everything had a purpose
* I think you could explain the motivation behind your choices better, e.g. I didn’t understand at first how you handled the region term when fitting your model

References:

* Looked outside of course material
* I think references get their own page in ASA format, but I might have been looking at the wrong style guide

Technical Appendix:

* Lots of meaningful visualizations
* Felt a bit disorganized at first