6.5/12 → 3.25/6

Problem (circle): R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 31

1. Formatting: 0.75/1

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

- too many digits

2. Introduction/Background: 0.5/1

brief statement of scientific question — how exactly do you do it? what does 'reliable' mean?

all variables defined

3. EDA: 0.5/2 all vars

univariate numerical — bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical — bivariate graphical

4. Model fitting: 1/2

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected — description is vague

define all terms — AIC,

(*)

5. Model assessment: (inference relies on these assumptions)

CLEARLY state model assumptions: 1.25/2

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated (auto-corr fn)
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE — qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

) First explain these plots before interpreting

Don't need Shapiro-Wilk

(*) what do you do about multicolinearity?

- Section 5 needs description + interpretation + explain and interpret Figure 4 (which should be SQUARE)

4/8

1/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.75/1 7. Plots: (shapes)

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.25/1 (*) 8. Conclusions write out, not bullet points

recap analysis state and interpret

main findings

- RMSE mis-interpreted
- Adj R^2 also mis-interpreted

0.5/1 - ↑ savings ↓MY not a conclusion from the model

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

(*) How can model be used to assess market conds?

- Don't need Tables 6+7

2.5/4

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 41 7.75/12 → 3.875/6

1. Formatting:

1/1

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

2. Introduction/Background:

0.75/1

brief statement of scientific question (also effect size)

all variables defined

1.75/2

3. EDA:

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical

Don't need boxplots — SQUAREplots

1.5/2

4. Model fitting: (re-name terms + only use scientific notation where necessary)

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms

- What does '11 on 6' DF mean?
- write hypotheses mathematically

1/2

5. Model assessment:

CLEARLY state model assumptions: - explain D-W if using

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE – qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

} explain then interpret plots, then conclude

6/2

0.25/1 - only use scientific notation where necessary

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable → no +ε max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.75/1 7. Plots: ugly shapes – Diagnostic plots

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.25/1 8. Conclusions – Don't need 3-layer sectioning

recap analysis state and interpret not correct

main findings

(+EDA)

- The 'key predictors' section can be inferred from the cor. matrix, Don't need the model

0.5/1 9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

- cite primary refs

1.75/4

4.25/12 → 2.125/6

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 42

1. Formatting:

0.25/1

all margins 2.5cm — **informative title**

12 pt size throughout — member names on all pgs

no raw R code or output — all pages numbered

max **7** pages — no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

(including tables) too many digits

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

brief statement of scientific question — delete 'predictive'

all variables defined

0.75/2 3. EDA: Don't need Table 1 (or sec 2.1

univariate numerical — bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical — bivariate graphical

- 'seems to be' (+/- corr)??

} you can combine these into 1 plot

0.25/2 4. Model fitting: Don't need pair-wise

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms — AIC, RSS

- Write hyps mathematically
- F-stat DF incorrect

0.5/2 5. Model assessment: explanations superficial

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted — incorrect / incomplete interpretation

explain plots, then interpret then conclude

2.75/8

0.5/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.5/1

7. Plots:

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

+ number all figures

0.25/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis state and ~~interpret~~ not correct

main findings

RMSE interpretation not correct

0.25/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

logic very hard to follow

- no refs

1.5/4

4.75/12 → 2.375/0

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 43

1. Formatting:

0.25/1

all margins 2.5cm — **informative title**

12 pt size — member names on all pgs

no raw R code or output — all pages numbered

max **7** pages — no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

– too many digits

0.75/1 2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question – not entirely precise

all variables defined

1/2 3. EDA: 'Shapiro tests' not defined

univariate numerical — bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical — bivariate graphical all pairs

– histograms

0.75/2 4. Model fitting: 'significant' not 'relevant'

define model mathematically – BEFORE fitting

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms AIC + minimize (not maximize)

– ests + SEs = 0 ??

5. Model assessment: Table not described and interpreted

0.5/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE – qq normal plot of residuals,) explain then interpret plots then conclude

residuals vs. fitted

3.25

0.5/1 coefs = 0 ??

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

use mortgage yield (like before) instead of y

0.5/1 7. Plots: (Diagnostic plots) + number each figure

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.25/1 8. Conclusions Vague statements

recap analysis state and interpret not correct

main findings

0.25 9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) : logic very difficult to follow

poor satisfactory good excellent

-no refs

- SQUARE QQ plots

1.5/4

6.5/12 → 3.25/6

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 46

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

1/1

0.75/1 2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question not entirely correct

all variables defined

1/2 3. EDA: - SQUARE QQ plots

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical all pairs

histograms

0.75/2 4. Model fitting: logic hard to follow

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms AIC

0.75/2 5. Model assessment:

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0 - resids always sum to 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated - D-W test not described
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE - qq normal plot of residuals, - explain plots before interpreting

residuals vs. fitted incomplete interpretation

4.25/8

0.75/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.75/1

7. Plots: many plots too large

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.25/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis state and interpret main findings

vague - you can infer what you say from cor. matrix, don't need model for this

0.5/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

- square QQ plots
- somewhat incomplete

2.25/4

6.75/12 → 3.325/6

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 47

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

4/4

0.75/1 2. Introduction/Background: use more paragraphing

brief statement of scientific question – explicitly

all variables defined

1.25/2 3. EDA: – Don't need table! Don't need Figure!

univariate numerical bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical bivariate graphical – SQUARE plots

summary statistics only + mort yield

0.5/2 4. Model fitting:

define model mathematically – First

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected make starting model more clear + describe stepwise procedure (specifically)

define all terms AIC/BIC/RMSE

– Transpose VIF graph or just list values in table

– Reset test not described

5. Model assessment:

0.5/2 CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE – qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

Explain the plots, then (correctly) interpret, then conclude

– You don't "validate whether...")

4/8 – BP Test not explained (but not needed)

0.75/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

1/1

7. Plots: (ok)

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1

8. Conclusions many vague statements

recap analysis state and interpret main findings

0.5/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

logic somewhat difficult to follow spell check

- only use 'significantly' in the context of a statistical test (not colloquially)
- use more paragraphing
- Explain why your metrics suggest log(X)'s
- Don't start sentence with 'meaning', the sentence is incomplete

2.75/4

(*) Don't need to re-do

10.25/12 → 5.125/6

6/6

Problem (circle): R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 48

1. Formatting:

1/1

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

1/1

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

2/2

3. EDA: + Q1, Q3

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical

1.5/2

4. Model fitting: Table 3 incomplete - t-stats, p-values

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS) - Do you consider VIFs?

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms

(*) To compare F-stats, need to compare p-values (because different df)

5. Model assessment:

1.25/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE - qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

) Explain plots before interpretation + conclusions

(*) also, should write hypothesis tests mathematically

6.75/8

1/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

7. Plots:

1/1

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis state and ~~interpret~~ (expected increase/decrease)

main findings

1/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

3.5/4

Problem (circle): R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 49 7.5/12 → 3.75/6

1. Formatting:

1/1

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

1.75/2 3. EDA: (explain significance tests for corrs)

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical

Don't need Figures 1+2

0.75/2 4. Model fitting:

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected — Describe stepwise procedure

define all terms — β's, i

- interpretation of R^2_{adj} not entirely correct

5. Model assessment:

0.5/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE – qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted) Explain plots, then interpret then conclude

Vfs 'confirm'?

5/8

0.75/1 Mis on β's

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.75/1

7. Plots:

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.25/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis state and interpret not correct

main findings

0.75/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

2.5/4

6.75/12 → 3.375/6

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 5

1. Formatting:

0.75/1

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

- too many digits

2. Introduction/Background:

0.75/1

brief statement of scientific question – not entirely precise

all variables defined

1/2

3. EDA:

univariate numerical — bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical — bivariate graphical — all pairwise

- Don't need Figure 2

0.75/2 (*)

4. Model fitting: your results would be more clear in a table

define model mathematically first

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms AIC

what does 'greedy models' mean?

1/2

5. Model assessment:

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted – also can assess $E(\epsilon)=0$

(*) Don't need all estimated models

First explain plots before interpretation + conclusions

4.25/8

0.75/1 Make CLEAR

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.75/1 7. Plots: Figures 5+6 too big - reduce size and put side by side

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1 8. Conclusions

recap analysis (+ EDA) state and interpret not correct

main findings

0.5/1 9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) : logic hard to follow

poor satisfactory good excellent

- no refs
- forward / backward / stepwise selection (not model)

2.5/4

9/12 → 4.5/6

Problem (circle) : (R1) / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 52

1. Formatting:

4/4

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title** (Health Data?)
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

0.75/1 2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question not entirely precise

all variables defined

1.75/2 3. EDA: write out words ⊛

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical – square

where is the interpretation of the QQ plots?

1.25/2 4. Model fitting:

define model mathematically (no $\hat{}$, with $+\epsilon$)

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms

- specify all hypothesis tests mathematically
- better model between 2, not best
- don't 'ensure validity'

1.5/2 5. Model assessment:

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0 – resids always sum to 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed – short (not long) tails

carry out assessment (graphics):

qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

⊛ you can combine upper diagonal of Table 2 with Figure 3

DW test not described

6.25

0.75/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

no ^ on coefs?

0.75/1

7. Plots:

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1

8. Conclusions not 'validity confirmed'

recap analysis state and interpret not entirely correct

main findings

0.75/2

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references):

poor satisfactory good excellent

- square QQ plots
- F-value (not f-value)

2.75/4

6/12 → 3/8

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 53

1. Formatting:

0.5/1

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

(QQ plot (Figure 5)

0.75/1

2. Introduction/Background:

- brief statement of scientific question) make more clear
- all variables defined

0.75/2

3. EDA: incomplete - 5 number summary

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical - all pairs

- Histograms not Boxplots

1.25/3

4. Model fitting:

- define model mathematically
- state how model fitted (ie, LS) Before fitting
- CLEARLY describe how modelselected don't need more detail on this
- define all terms ~~AIC~~

5. Model assessment: validity? not 'confirmed'

1/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

additive effect?

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE - qq normal plot of residuals, incomplete interpretation

residuals vs. fitted

* linear in PARAMETERS, not 'predictors'
- interpretations unclear and/or incorrect
- use BOXPLOTS, since you can compare to y

4.25/8

0/1 not done?

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.75/1 7. Plots: Figures 5+6 too big - reduce size + put side by side

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1 8. Conclusions

recap analysis state and interpret

main findings

0.5/1 9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references): run-on sentences, logic somewhat hard to follow - hard to read

poor satisfactory good excellent

- adding city names might make the plots too hard to read
- look at vif values (.75 or .8) to see about removing correlated vars
- I would not go with standardizing the X's unless there is a highly influential one(s)
- Yes avoid multicollinearity (use vif)

1.75/4

8.75/12 → 4.375/6

Problem (circle): R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 54

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

1/1

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question (variables, not 'factors')

all variables defined

1/1

3. EDA: SQUARE Q-Q

univariate numerical — bivariate numerical (cor) - only need lower diag

univariate graphical — bivariate graphical all pairs

1.5/2

4. Model fitting: use paragraphing

define model mathematically no with ε

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms AIC

- you already know which vars 'correlate most'

vifs?

1.25/2

5. Model assessment:

CLEARLY state model assumptions: — you can carry out OLS even if these don't hold — the assumptions are needed for valid inference

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

1.25/2

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

First explain the plots, then interpret then conclude

↳ incomplete interpretation

6/8

1/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.75/1

7. Plots: figure 3 too big

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis state and interpret

main findings

use more paragraphing/logic

0.5/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) : somewhat difficult to follow

poor satisfactory good excellent

2.75/4

8.25/12 → 4.125/6

Problem (circle): R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 55

1. Formatting:

Y / 1

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

0.75 / 1

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question — not entirely precise

all variables defined

1.75/2

3. EDA: Figure 1 - make plots square

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical

Don't need Figure 2

1/2

4. Model fitting: somewhat unclear

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms - AIC (criterion) - cross-validation procedure not defined

1/2

5. Model assessment: assess, not 'verify'

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

) Explain, then interpret then conclude

5.5/8

0.75/1

no tE

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

1/1

7. Plots:

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis (+EDA) state and interpret not correct

main findings

0.5/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) : +schaal?

poor satisfactory good excellent

-square QQ plots

2.75/4

9.25/12 → 7.625/6

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 56

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

0.75/1

Figure 3

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

Variables (not 'factors')

3. EDA:

1.75/2

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical

Don't need Figure 1 - Square

4. Model fitting: Logic somewhat difficult to follow

1/2

define model mathematically - (full model) at first introduction of LS

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms AIC

- write hyps mathematically

5. Model assessment:

1.25/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0 - residuals always sum to 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

) Explain plots, then interpret then conclude

5.75/6

1/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

1/1

7. Plots:

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.75/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis (+EDA) state and interpret

main findings

0.75/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

logic somewhat hard to follow Spell check

poor satisfactory good excellent

3.5/4

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 57 8/12 → 4/6

1. Formatting: 0.75/1

all margins 2.5cm — **informative title**

12 pt size — member names on all pgs

no raw R code or output — all pages numbered

max **7** pages — no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

- Remove contents

2. Introduction/Background: 0.75/1 run-on sentences + don't need

brief statement of scientific question — model to explore correlation

all variables defined — (My only implicit)

3. EDA: 1.75/2

univariate numerical — bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical — bivariate graphical — make plots square + number

4. Model fitting: 1.5/2

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms

(Akaike weights interpreted as conditional probs)

5. Model assessment: 1/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0 — How do you conclude this?
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted — incomplete interpretation

Explain plots, then interpret, then conclude

D-W not explained

5.75/8

0.75/1 6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically** note

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.5/1 7. Plots: Figures 1+2 too big, reduce size + put side by side number all plots

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.25/1 8. Conclusions

recap analysis state and interpret not correct

main findings

0.75/1 9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) : — + spelling

poor satisfactory good excellent

2.25/4

8.25/12 → 4.125/6

Problem (circle): R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 58

1. Formatting: 0.75/1

- all margins 2.5cm
- 12 pt size
- **no raw R code or output** (Figure 3,4 labels (too many digits))
- max **7** pages
- **informative title**
- member names on all pgs
- all pages numbered
- no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

2. Introduction/Background: 0.75/1

- brief statement of scientific question
- all variables defined

) hard to read, use paragraphs

3. EDA: spell out words 1.75/2

- univariate numerical
- univariate graphical
- bivariate numerical (cor)
- bivariate graphical – make square plots

4. Model fitting: 1.5/2 (*)

⇒ Formula bottom p. 4 needs ^'s

- define model mathematically
- state how model fitted (ie, LS)
- CLEARLY describe how modelselected
- define all terms

- suggesting not significant?
- what does 'quite well optimized' mean?

5. Model assessment: 1.25/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

- SQUARE ✓ qq normal plot of residuals,
- residuals vs. fitted

) Explain plots, then interpret then conclude

(*) you don't need VIF to assess correlation

6/8

0.75/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable — max **2 sig digits** on coefs

Mortgage yield

0.75/1

7. Plots:

label size (not too small) — informative captions

placement — **NOT BLURRY**

0.25/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis — state and interpret main findings

0.5/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor — satisfactory — good — excellent

- no refs
- use paragraphing - logic hard to follow in parts

2.25/4

(*) Don't need to re-do

10.5/12 → 5.25/6

Problem (circle) : R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 59

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

→ 6/6

1/1

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

2/2

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical

4. Model fitting:

1.75/2

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected — what are 'best' 'worst'

define all terms

5. Model assessment:

1.25/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

) explain then interpret plots (Don't just conclude)

7/8

1/1

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.75/1

7. Plots: Figures 2+3 too big - reduce size + put side by side

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.75/1

8. Conclusions

recap analysis (+ EDA) state and interpret

main findings

1/1

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) : (ok)

poor satisfactory good excellent

3.5/4

9.25/12 → 4.625/6

Problem (circle): R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 60

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

Y / 1

2. Introduction/Background:

Y / 1

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

1.25/2

univariate numerical — bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical — bivariate graphical – all pairs

– Don't need figure 2

4. Model fitting:

1.25/2

define model mathematically – no ^ with TE

state how model fitted (ie, LS) – Don't need the details

CLEARLY describe how modelselected

define all terms AIC, BIC

5. Model assessment:

1.25/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0 assume?
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE – qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted – incomplete interpretation

6.25/8

0.75/1 NO TE

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

7. Plots:

1/1

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1 8. Conclusions use paragraphing

recap analysis (+EDA) state and interpret not entirely correct

main findings

0.75/1 9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

(cite primary refs when possible, but ok)

3/4

9/12 → 4.5/6

Problem (circle): R1 / R2 / A1 / A2 Group number 98

1. Formatting:

1/1

all margins 2.5cm	**informative title**
12 pt size	member names on all pgs
no raw R code or output	all pages numbered
max **7** pages	no blurry plots (**NOT png**)

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

1.75/2

univariate numerical	bivariate numerical (cor)
univariate graphical	bivariate graphical - square plots

4. Model fitting:

1.25/2

define model mathematically

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how modelselected not done?

define all terms

5. Model assessment:

1.5/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1. errors have mean 0
2. errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
3. errors are uncorrelated
4. errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):

SQUARE - qq normal plot of residuals,

residuals vs. fitted

+ Explain plots

Incompletely interpreted

6.5/8

0.5/1 what is the final model?

6. Write out final estimated model **mathematically**

hat on response variable max **2 sig digits** on coefs

1/1

7. Plots:

label size (not too small) informative captions

placement **NOT BLURRY**

0.5/1 Factors 'like'?

8. Conclusions

recap analysis state and interpret

main findings

0.5/1 somewhat difficult to follow the logic in parts

9. Overall presentation (clarity of explanations and language, appropriate citations / references) :

poor satisfactory good excellent

- no refs

2.5/4