**All individuals** will be allocated a group project to review.  It is likely the different individuals within the same group will have different groups to review.  This should give a breadth of different experiences within the group.  Each group should then receive feedback from multiple individuals on their group report.

Technical solutions will be provided on myplace for this practical so you do not need to assess whether the model is correct.  Think only about the content of the report.  How well are the techniques explained?  Does the report read clearly?

Structure your feedback around the following sections whilst considering each of the questions/comments listed. Please do not just answer yes/no.  Provide some of your thoughts for each section where possible. If you have additional comments to those mentioned in each section then please add.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Aim** | Is the aim of the project clearly defined?  Are the research questions clearly stated? |
| **Introduction** | Has relevant background to the problem been discussed?  Has additional research been done to provide background which is not given in the practical outline?  Are any relevant references used? |
| **Methods** | The methodology used should be clearly described and linked to the associated research questions.  The software used should be mentioned. |
| **Results** | The results section should state results only.  There should be no discussion or interpretation of results in this section.  Are the results clearly stated with measures of both central location and variability (e.g. mean, 95% interval based on quantiles)?  Are results presented for all research questions?  Are relevant tables/figures referred to in the text?  Figures:  Are they clear?  Do they have appropriate axis labels, legends? Do the figures have captions which clearly explain what is presented in the table?  Tables:  Do the headings clearly convey what is presented in the table? Are the tables consistent in terms of decimal places, text alignment.  Do the tables have captions which clearly explain what is presented in the table?  All tables/figures should be discussed in the text.  Is there any additional material that has not been discussed? |
| **Discussion/Conclusion** | Are the results then put into context? What does the model tell us?  Is there anything similar in the literature that it can be compared to?  If so is this references?  Is there a description of potential limitations to the model?  What is the overall conclusion?  Is it clearly stated? |
| **Overall impression** | Was the report clear and presented well?  Were there any issues with spelling or grammar?  Any other comments. |
| **Appendices** | Was the R code provided in an appendix?  Was the appendix with tables and figures laid out clearly?  If used, were any references consistently presented and numbered to allow linkage to the text? |