

Title - 5/5

Nice title! I would expand the abbreviation - most readers probably won't know what CDI is unless and until you explain it explicitly.

Author/Contact Info - 0/0

All information present.

Abstract - 5/5

Good content - covers all the essential elements and recaps the IDMRAD structure of the paper. I do wonder if it's a bit too long and goes into too much detail. I don't think you to specify which variables made it into your final model. Additionally, I would say "hospital beds" instead of hosp.beds since the data and the variable names have not been introduced yet.

Introduction - 10/10

I love that you took the time to explain why the paper's topic is important and relevant to the stakeholders. Nothing really to critique here! Nicely done.

Data - 5/5

Consider formatting the data definitions into a table of some sort. R markdown has some built in functionality for this (see the kable() function from knitr) but you could also just do it in excel/sheets. The tables and figures here are nice but I would suggest adding a paragraph or two pulling out some key takeaways.

Methods - 5/5

Very thorough - covers all the important topics. Might be a bit too specific - consider leaving some of this material for the technical appendix.

Results - 10/10

Excellent work! Just like the methods though, I'm concerned you've gone into too much depth. Instead you could move much of this material into the appendix and focus on (a) emphasizing the most important points and (b) interpreting and applying to the social scientists' needs.

Discussion - 10/10

Love that you included examples of future work. On the third question, I think if you do a little more digging you'll be able to identify which data is missing and why. If you look up which states are not included, it will probably pop out at you.

Mechanics - 5/5

Very minor point but maybe consider using a font with serifs? Studies have shown sans-serif fonts slow people down and inhibit reading comprehension. Definitely true in my experience! In addition, some of the paragraphs (especially in results) were lengthy and could be improved by breaking them into smaller parts.

Statistical Content - 40/40

Excellent all round! One point of concern: when examining crime rate, you used the formula $\log(\text{crimes})/\text{pop}$ when I suspect you meant to run $\log(\text{crimes}/\text{pop})$. The latter seems much more interpretable.

References & Citations - 5/5

Everything looks good! Nothing to critique.

Technical Appendix - 0/0

I would suppress the output that prints for stepwise regression - it adds length to your appendix but doesn't actually contribute much to the reader's understanding.

Total Points ----- 100/100

Nicely done!