

Category	Criteria	Comments	Pts
Title	Clear, Interesting, Focused	Good – It is focused Could improve – I would drop ‘from CDI data’ to make it shorter and because CDI is not defined yet	5
Author/Contact Info	Your name and email addr.	Good – Could improve –	0
Abstract	Summarizes I,D,M,R,D in 3-6 brief clear sentences.	Good – Summarizes the paper well Could improve – A positive relationship between average income per person and per capita unemployment rate seems surprising so maybe don’t describe as obvious? Also I’m not sure if that level of detail (whether the coefficients are pos/neg) is necessary this early.	5
Introduction	Brief, clear, to the point; context for the problem; What is the problem/aim of the study? What questions will be answered?	Good – Clear and to the point Could improve – “440 of the most populous” is mentioned in the next section so might not be needed here	10
Data	How 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!	Good – good discussion of number of unique values Could improve - I would say what SD is rather than just say a function in R - You mention using histograms, boxplots, etc, but I only see histograms and no boxplots. - I don’t know if there should be conclusions about the correlation or stuff about collinearity in the Data section. I think that belongs later.	5
Methods	List the methods and/or analyses that will be used to answer each question stated in the Introduction. No data analysis, graphing, model fitting, etc. appears here	Good – good to list what specific research question each method is answering Could improve - maybe quickly mention research questions 1 and 4, even though	5

		<p>they don't require many methods. Same for the results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - last paragraph: second sentence mentions backward stepwise selection and all subsets – aren't those 2 different things? last sentence is a little unclear: why were the diagnostic plots and MMplots looked at? 	
Results	<p>Statistical analysis & results in order parallel to Intro & Methods; no new methods or data; no big picture discussion</p>	<p>Good – question 2: good to compare using ANOVA and AIC/BIC Could improve Question 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – I'm not sure if the anova output table should be here? maybe just describe the results and refer to the table in the tech appendix? - same comment as above for the diagnostic plots. maybe only include the one for the final chosen model? <p>Question 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -on page 10, after the interpretations, its not clear to me what the BIC-based model and AIC-based model are referring to - Some of the wording looks similar to the HW 6 solutions. Make sure your own wording is used. - I might leave the log lambda vs coefficients chart in the tech appx unless you decide to explain it more clearly here, since it is pretty technical (I don't even understand what it means exactly) -probably should give the actual model resulting from LASSO instead of just saying it's almost the same as before. 	10
Discussion	<p>Recap findings; address main problem/question; strengths & weaknesses; implications, unanswered questions, future research</p>	<p>Good – good to include chart for models strength/weaknesses Could improve – I think some of this discussion belongs in results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -some of the wording looks similar to HW solutions again 	10

		<p>- are there really only 373 counties? sometimes US counties in different states have the same name</p> <p>-is there anything wrong with how these counties were chosen for this study?</p>	
Mechanics	Follows C-C-C as much as possible (sentences, paragraphs & sections); Grammatical; Easy to follow	<p>Good – I can follow the logic of most paragraphs</p> <p>Could improve – Some of the grammar, punctuations, and verb tenses are a little off. Feel free to ask me (Zach) any questions on grammar or sentence structure.</p>	5
Statistical Content	Correctly 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)	<p>Good – uses multiple methods to select variables</p> <p>Could improve – some of the statistical methods could be more explained, like saying what LASSO is.</p>	40
References & Citations	Follow ASA guide, “The Reference List” & “Reference Citations” (be sure to cite all sources!)	<p>Good – looks good</p> <p>Could improve –</p>	5
Technical Appendix	Helps 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.	<p>Good –</p> <p>Could improve – a little crowded but you already said that what you submitted isn’t the final version. you probably don’t need to include all the stepwise selection steps</p>	0