

**Title - 5/5**

Nice title! I would change the format to use title case (that is, capitalize all words except articles and prepositions).

**Author/Contact Info - 0/0**

All information present.

**Abstract - 5/5**

Excellent job recapping the key points of the paper. Looks like it's missing a recap of the discussion section though.

**Introduction - 10/10**

Good job explaining the reason why you're devoting time to analyze this data in the first place. Maybe work on explaining how the three research topics tie together into one story.

**Data - 5/5**

Good job being comprehensive including all the relevant variables. Feels a little short though. Instead of just pointing to the technical appendix and table 2, I would recommend including a paragraph or two highlighting what they show. Also, maybe include definitions of the key variables instead of just using the default names like ``pct.hs.grad``. Your reader likely won't know what that means.

**Methods - 5/5**

Short and to the point! Good job explaining the approach you used to answer the research questions. What about the third topic (how you assessed the importance or irrelevance of the missing data)?

**Results - 10/10**

Excellent work interpreting the coefficients in a real world context. I have a few concerns that I discuss in the statistical content section

**Discussion - 10/10**

Glad to see the missing data is discussed here! I think if you do a little more digging you'll be able to identify which data is missing and why (no spoilers, unless you want them!). Hint: look up which states are not included and consider why.

**Mechanics - 5/5**

It looks like the hyperlinks in your in-text citations have been formatted in an odd way. They don't read the way they're supposed to. There are also a handful of grammatical mistakes - I'd be happy to go through and help you clean those up!

**Statistical Content - 40/40**

The interpretation of the models are great and the transformations seem reasonable. But I feel like the material here isn't terribly in depth. There isn't any discussion of the model selection

approaches. You also don't compare the results of the different models (ie. stepwise using AIC vs BIC, compare with LASSO, etc.).

### **References & Citations - 5/5**

I would add a citation for the data. Also, the citations don't follow standard APA format (the second line of a citation should be indented). Though I'm not sure how seriously that matters for this class?

### **Technical Appendix - 0/0**

Very thorough and nicely organized. I would make sure the code and its output stay together. Knitting from an R-markdown file is probably the easiest way to do that. You can merge the two pdfs (paper and appendix) after the fact.

**Total Points ----- 100/100**

Nicely done!