

Group 16 R2 7.5/12 → 3.75/6

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 *DL*

no blurry plots (NOT png)

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

4. Model fitting:

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

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):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

Don't need hist

** If your model includes interactions, you must include all marginal terms (ie, variables in the interactions)*

0.5/0.5

1/1

1.75/2

0.75/2

0.75/2

explain + interpret these plots

to don't read QQ

should be square

Square

4.75

model incorrect

0.5/1

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)

captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

1/1.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

+ interpret
(state main findings)

0.5/1

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- references for data and methods

- spell check

- modeling is superficial, try several models

then select one and explain how.

- introduce model before estimated fitted model

- Table 4 not clear

2.75

Group 17 R2 7.75/12 → 3.875/6

1. Formatting:

0.5/0.5

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

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

- brief statement of scientific question
- all variables defined

3. EDA:

1/2

- univariate numerical
- univariate graphical

show all summary stats in a table

- bivariate numerical (cor)
- bivariate graphical

4. Model fitting:

0.75/2

- state how model fitted (ie, LS)
- CLEARLY** describe how model selected

define all terms
- too many digits

what does stepwise forward/backward mean? criteria?
Did you try interactions?

5. Model assessment:

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

explain and interpret

carry out assessment (graphics):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

square

Table of Reg output; write out model(s) before estimation

1.25

which is your final model?

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:

label size (not too small)

captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

1.25/1.5

8. Conclusions

(expand
recap analysis)

state main findings

0.75/1

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs methods

3.5

Group 18 RL

9.25/12 → 4.75/6

good job!

1. Formatting:

0.5 / 0

all margins 2.5cm

12 pt size

no raw R code or output

max 7 pages *ok*

informative title

member names on all pgs

all pages numbered

no blurry plots (NOT png)

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

1.75/2

univariate numerical

univariate graphical

don't need fig 1

bivariate numerical (cor)

bivariate graphical

ALL vars

4. Model fitting:

1.25 / 2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

**

5. Model assessment:

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

- errors have mean 0
- errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
- errors are uncorrelated
- errors are normally distributed

what is stepwise?

want to know if submodel not (significantly) worse

errors, not models, satisfy these

you assess assumptions, not 'verify'

carry out assessment (graphics):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

interpret these plots

* first do model fitting, THEN explore interactions, etc

- Don't re-name vars (x₁, x₂, etc), use original names

- show table(s) of reg. results

- I think your final model is reversed - check your F-test

6

1 / 1
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)

captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

0.75 / 1.5
8. Conclusions

recap analysis

(+ interpret)
state main findings

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- need refs (data + methods)

- it is very important to check your F test;

The NULL hyp is that the sub model is

good enough; ie, $H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_n = 0$

against the alt A : at least one of the β 's $\neq 0$

\Rightarrow so a small p-value is evidence against
the null (smaller model)

\Rightarrow need the bigger model.

You could do a stepwise, or just test some
submodels 'by hand' to reduce from
the full model

3.25

9.25/12 → 4.625/6

Group 19 R2 Brock Vidunuk Yakovlev L

good job!

0.5/0.5

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

all variables defined

3. EDA:

2/2

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

4. Model fitting

1.25/2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

write model mathematically (top p. 4)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

AIC stepwise criterion

5. Model assessment:

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

1.25/2

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

Explain + interpret

carry out assessment (graphics): qq normal plot of residuals, residuals vs. fitted

square

- Either don't use Durbin Watson or explain

1/1 (ok)

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)

also for tables
captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

1/1.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

state main findings

0.5/1

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs (data and methods)

- write p-value 0.000 as 0.000×10^{-3}

- Did you try any interaction models?

- difference between table 3 & 4?

3.25

Group 200 RL $6.5/2 \rightarrow 3.25/6$ (2 submissions - only need 1)

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm

- Don't need course info
informative title

0.5/0.5 12 pt size

member names on all pgs

no raw R code or output

all pages numbered

max 7 pages OK

no blurry plots (NOT png)

- Don't need date

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

univariate numerical \sim

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

put all stats in a table
put as a correlation matrix
need ALL vars
not in text

4. Model fitting:

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected \sim

define all terms

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):

qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

not done?
- interpret (+ explain)

- don't need scatterplots Fig 2

0.75/1

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

hat on response variable

max **2 sig digits** on coefs

0.5/1

7. Plots:

you don't refer to fig 3 in text
(label size (not too small)

captions

(not completely correct)

placement

NOT BLURRY

0.75/1.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

(be more explicit and direct)
state main findings

0.5/1

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs (data and methods)

- use single column format

- Fig P.5 ? not labeled or captioned,
looks like it belongs in EPA section

- why is there text before the intro?

- your report is very hard to follow, please
define everything and put things into
a logical order

2.5

Group 21 R2

9.5/12 → 4.75/6
good job

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm

informative title

0.5/0.5

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)

- Don't need date

2. Introduction/Background:

0.75/1

brief statement of scientific question

(give background for the specific context)

all variables defined

3. EDA: Exploratory (+ below)

1.75/2

All vars

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

histograms not boxplots

4. Model fitting:

1.5/2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

AIC, stepwise procedure

5. Model assessment:

1.5/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

- errors have mean 0
- errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
- errors are uncorrelated
- errors are normally distributed

(also plot errors vs index order)
square + interpret

carry out assessment (graphics):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

don't need plot (a) and (b) is qq not hist

Theoretically should be 0 under linearity
- Don't have to do a test for homoscedasticity, but if you do, you have to explain the test

6

✓

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

hat on response variable

max **2 sig digits** on coefs

7. Plots:

label size (not too small)

captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

state main findings

exploratory

+ interpret

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

*- cite primary refs (not course slides),
and you should cite all refs in the text
- use only primary, specific (not general)
refs (data and methods)*

✓
0.75
0.75

3.5

Group 22 R2

6.25/12 → 3.125/6

1. Formatting:

0.5/0.5

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

in the specific context of this problem

all variables defined

3. EDA:

1.25/2

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

correlation matrix

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

histograms not boxplots

4. Model fitting:

0.75/2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

- too many digits

square scatterplots, explain boxplots

5. Model assessment:

try several models then select one and explain the process

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

0.75/2

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

square + explain & interpret

* analysis is superficial

- the plots don't 'verify' the assumptions, they 'support' them - but you need to explain why

0.5 / 1
0.5 / 1
0.75 / 1
0.5 / 1

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

hat on response variable

max **2 sig digits** on coefs

7. Plots:

label size (not too small)
placement

captions

NOT BLURRY

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

interpret + explain
state main findings

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

refs at end, methods + data

2.25

Group 23 Q2 8/12 → 4/6 good job!

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm

0.5/0.5

12 pt size

no raw R code or output

max 7 pages ok

- no blue writing

informative title

member names on all pgs

all pages numbered

no blurry plots (NOT png)

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

- what are union shop and sector A?

3. EDA:

write Exploratory Data Analysis

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

Don't need Fig 1, have histograms

in Fig 3, don't need Fig 2

what do colors correspond to?

4. Model fitting:

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

- did you try any interactions? stepwise, etc. how do you normalize?

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):

qq normal plot of residuals, residuals vs. fitted

square - only need for your final model

* your description is superficial, also put intercept first

Fig 4 before Final estimated model - also, what is your final model - not clear

QQ plot doesn't show how good a model is, only whether what you are plotting is approx normally dist.

explain + interpret plots

5.5

0.5/1

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

hat on response variable

max **2 sig digits** on coefs

just 1

0.5/1

7. Plots:

label size (not too small)

captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

1/0.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

state main findings

0.5/1

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs (data + methods)

+ see other side

2.5

Group 24 R2 5.5/12 → 2.75/6

1. Formatting:

0.5/0.5

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

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

- brief statement of scientific question
- all variables defined

3. EDA:

0.75/2

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

all vars → all pairwise

4. Model fitting:

0.75/2

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

define meaning of X_1, \dots
model top p.4: β_0, β_1

5. Model assessment:

0.25/2

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

- errors have mean 0
- errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
- errors are uncorrelated
- errors are normally distributed

* show all reg out put, also other models, interactions, etc
for → express models mathematically, not 'logically'

carry out assessment (graphics):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

not done?

- your conclusions bottom p.3 - difficult to understand what you mean

3 25

0.25/

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

hat on response variable

max 2 sig digits on coefs

0.25/

7. Plots:

label size (not too small)

captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

0.75/ 1.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

(+ interpret
state main findings)

0.5/

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs (data + methods)

- all figures and tables should have a caption and be numbered (and cited in the text)

2.25

Group 25 R2 6.25/12 → 3.125/6

1. Formatting:

Don't need line with EPFL...

0.5/0.5

- 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 *ok*
- no blurry plots (**NO I png**)

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

- brief statement of scientific question
- all variables defined

3. EDA:

0.5/2

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

4. Model fitting:

+ write out the model

all pairs

- state how model fitted (ie, LS)
- CLEARLY describe how model selected

you need to describe the modeling process, not just jump straight to the final model

define all terms

5. Model assessment:

vague and superficial results

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

- errors have mean 0
- errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
- errors are uncorrelated
- errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics): qq normal plot of residuals, residuals vs. fitted

not done

Table 1 should be here, not later
These results need to be associated with a model, this table lacks context

3.5

0.75 / 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)

captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

for plots and tables
should be descriptive

1 / 1.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

state main findings

0.5 / 1

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- need refs (data + methods)

- cite the refs in your report

2.75

* Don't need to re-do, will be 6/6

Group 26 R2 10/12 → 5/6

1. Formatting:

0.5 / 0.5

all margins 2.5cm

12 pt size

no raw R code or output

max 7 pages *ok*

Don't need 2nd line
informative title

member names on all pgs

all pages numbered

no blurry plots (NOT png)

- Don't need date

2. Introduction/Background:

1/2

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

1.25 / 2

univariate numerical

univariate graphical *(OK)*

bivariate numerical (cor)

bivariate graphical

put all stats in table *all vars*

4. Model fitting:

1/2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

table: needs number and caption - too many digits
+ stepwise, etc
VIF, Box-Cox, etc

* (circled)

5. Model assessment:

1.5

CLEARLY state model assumptions:

- errors have mean 0
- errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
- errors are uncorrelated
- errors are normally distributed

(But don't need to do)

If you do Shapiro-Wilks you must explain this test should be square (+ interpret)

carry out assessment (graphics):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

5.25

* your final model is not correct, since you have an interaction, both marginal terms must be included - you don't have Union shop

1/ K 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)

(make informative captions)

placement

NOT BLURRY

1/ 1.5 8. Conclusions

recap analysis

state main findings

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs (data + methods)

- tables have too many digits

- either don't re-name vars or put X-name in table beside original name - the way you have it makes it difficult to follow

3.75 + 1 (Box-Cox)

Group 27 R2 5.25 / 12 → 2.625 / 6

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm

12 pt size

no raw R code or output

max 7 pages *ok*

informative title

member names on all pgs

all pages numbered

no blurry plots (**NOT** png)

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

4. Model fitting:

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

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):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

(+ explain + interpret
more clearly)

0.5

1

0.5 / 2

0.5 / 2

1.25 / 2

3.25

square
procedure
→ models should have intercepts, unless you provide good reason
put relevant output in tables

) square

0.5/

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

+ intercept

hat on response variable

max 2 sig digits on coefs

0.75/

7. Plots:

(label size) (not too small)

captions

placement

NOT BLURRY

0.5/1.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

+ explain and interpret
state main findings

0.25/

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs (data + methods)

- each figure (and table) should have a caption
and a number (and refer to it in the text)

- no Raw R!! (+ too many digits)

Group 28 R2 8.75/12 → 4.375/6 good job!

1. Formatting:

all margins 2.5cm

0.5/0.5 (12 pt size)

- Don't need course description (first line)
- Don't need EPFL and email addresses
informative title
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

- Don't need first sentence
brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA: (ok)

2/2

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

- Don't need Fig 1 B

4. Model fitting:

1/2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

define the X's

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

- table 2 AFTER explanation and BEFORE assessment
- put after model fitting/selection

5. Model assessment:

stepwise?
explain + criteria?

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

not done?

you 'assess' normality NOT 'verify'

* where do you define the model with interactions?

5.75

- Table 3 should include p-values

Group 29 R2 7.5/12 → 3.75/6

1. Formatting:

0.5/0.5

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 *sh*

no blurry plots (NOT png)
Don't need names 2x on p.1

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

3. EDA:

0.75/2

univariate numerical

put all stats in table

bivariate numerical (cor)

Cor matrix

univariate graphical

- Don't need figs

bivariate graphical

(square)

4. Model fitting:

1/2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

First introduce model THEN estimate it

CLEARLY describe how model selected

widexath - }

define all terms

- superficial stepwise, AIC, F-stat for what test? p-value?

5. Model assessment:

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

carry out assessment (graphics):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

These should be square + interpret/explain these plots

either don't do Durbin-Watson or explain 'supported' not 'verified'

1.25

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

hat on response variable

max **2 sig digits** on coefs

7. Plots:

label size (not too small)

captions

(placement / layout)

NOT BLURRY

8. Conclusions

(more completely)
recap analysis

state main findings

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- need refs (data + methods)

3.25

Group 30 R2 5/12 → 2.5/6

1. Formatting:

0/0.5

all margins 2.5cm

informative title

(12 pt size)
no raw R code or output

member names on all pgs

all pages numbered

max 7 pages *OK*

no blurry plots (**NOT** png)

2. Introduction/Background:

brief statement of scientific question

all variables defined

+ meaningful var names
+ don't need states

3. EDA:

0.75/2

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

- square

4. Model fitting:

0.5/2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

define all terms

- no \wedge on X-vars

show stats in table, not text
- Don't need qq, histograms, instead of boxplots
- superficial explanation
→ fig 4 = ??

5. Model assessment:

0.75/2

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):

qq normal plot of residuals, residuals vs. fitted

↳ not done?

0.75 /

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

hat on response variable

max 2 sig digits on coefs

not explanatory vars

0.75 /

7. Plots:

label size (not too small)

captions

(placement)

NOT BLURRY

0.25 / 1.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

+ explain + interpret
state main findings

0.25 /

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs (data + methods)

- no RAW R !!

(*) If number in parentheses in final eq. use SEs, put under coefs

- Put all relevant reg out put in table(s)

Group GS R2 8.75/12 → 4.375/6 *good job!*

1. Formatting:

0.5/0.5

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

2. Introduction/Background:

1/1

- brief statement of scientific question
- all variables defined - *put var names in table rather than $\sqrt{2}$, ...*

3. EDA:

1.75/2

- univariate numerical
- univariate graphical
- bivariate numerical (cor) *1.00 (not '-')*
- bivariate graphical

4. Model fitting:

1/2

- state how model fitted (ie, LS) - *define model mathematically before fitting*
- CLEARLY describe how model selected
- define all terms *AIC, forward, backward... don't need to say what R fns you use, explain the methods*

5. Model assessment:

1.25/2

- CLEARLY state model assumptions:
 - errors have mean 0
 - errors are homoscedastic (same variance)
 - errors are uncorrelated
 - errors are normally distributed

carry out assessment (graphics):
 qq normal plot of residuals, (square?)
 residuals vs. fitted
explain + interpret plots

Group 70 R2 7.75/12 → 3.875/8

1. Formatting:

0.5/0.5

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

3 - Too much blank space

univariate numerical

bivariate numerical (cor)

univariate graphical

bivariate graphical

4. Model fitting:

- Don't need fig!

1/2

state how model fitted (ie, LS)

- Define model mathematically (not using R formula)

CLEARLY describe how model selected

- Include relevant reg output in table

define all terms AIC, etc

5. Model assessment: *

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

carry out assessment (graphics):
qq normal plot of residuals,
residuals vs. fitted

} square + explain & interpret these plots

* Linearity assumption better expressed as: outcome is linear fn. of the parameters

5-25

- I don't see how your model can be correct if union is a factor with 2 levels and sector A numeric

0.5/
0.75/1

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

hat on response variable

max 2 sig digits on coefs

no '*'

7. Plots:

label size (not too small)

captions

* only! interaction & f

placement

NOT BLURRY

correct the interpretation
state main findings

0.75/1.5

8. Conclusions

recap analysis

0.5/1

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

poor

satisfactory

good

excellent

- refs (data + methods)

- check your final model, it doesn't make sense to me

- you need to explain what you are doing

2.5