Zach:

Title:

* Not there yet

Author info:

* Looks good, nothing to change here

Abstract:

* Sections from R and M missing; I think the discussion sentence could go into more detail about what exactly your findings mean in a social science context
* All of the important conceptual information is there

Introduction:

* could be more specific on where the tasks came from or talk about why they're important.
* Describes all research questions clearly

Data:

* I think some EDA/numerical summaries could be good. For example, if you decide to use a transformation later on you could refer back to your EDA here to provide justification. Giving the reader a sense of what exactly the data looks like could be helpful
* Relevant table and qualitative summaries of the variables.

Methods:

* Concise and to the point, really easy to read
* Be more specific about the penalized regression method at the end

Results:

* you could specify increasing/decreasing for more of the relationships instead of just linear or not to give a context of what’s important from the EDA/modeling without having to refer to your plots
* Covers all relevant details well

Discussion:

* Some missing sections
* Discussion of the specific HI county was really useful and well-put

Mechanics:

* Writing was very clear overall, just missing some parts
* Seemed too informal but I’m not sure if this is a problem

Statistical Content:

* All analysis are on point and in-depth
* Some felt out of place (e.g. I don’t think you need the values of the F statistics in the discussion)

References:

* Looks good, no improvement needed

Technical Appendix:

* Has relevant plots and explanatory text
* Doesn’t have modeling or testing