Peer Review Evaluation Rubric

Case Study 4.1

Please follow the rubric below to grade your peer's Case Study submission. The numbers of the questions below correspond to the numbers in their submitted responses. If you have any questions or comments about this process, please post in the course Discussion Forum or reach out to the TA's privately. We are here to help! Best of luck.

1) Did they successfully load the data and include a histogram of the rating distribution? NOTE: R users may have a blank image for the histogram. This Is fine. Give them full credit if they have the correct code to generate the histogram of the data.

- Incomplete: No code is given or no attempt is made to load the data. **0 POINTS**
- Partially complete: Some code is given, but the histogram of the rating distribution appears incorrect or is missing (correct distribution should have mostly 3 and 4 ratings). **2 POINTS**
- Complete: The code correctly loads the data and they provide a nice histogram with some added explanation about the dataset. **3 POINTS**

2) Did they successfully compare the user-user/item-item models?

- Incomplete: They did not offer any response to the question or failed to answer the question at hand. **0 POINTS**
- Partially complete: They made a decent attempt at explaining the results of the models but may have forgotten part of the question. **2 POINTS**
- Complete: They completely answered the question, noting the performance between the user-user/item-item models and also noting that these 2 models are significantly better than the random model in terms of RMSE.

3) Did they successfully compare the matrix factorization model to the previous models?

- Incomplete: They did not offer any response to the question or failed to answer the question at hand. **0 POINTS**
- Partially complete: They made a decent attempt at explaining the results of the model but may have forgotten part of the question. **2 POINTS**
- Complete: They completely answered the question, noting the difference in structure between the user-user/item-item models (using a low-rank matrix factorization rather than the similarity of other users/items) and also noting that this new model is significantly better than the random model in terms of RMSE.

4) Did they correctly compute the precision/recall data for the 4 models?

- Incomplete: There is no data or code included. **0 POINTS**
- Poor: There is some data provided but it does not include correct/valid values for precision and recall (should be between 0 and 1, not negative). **1 POINT**
- Very good: There is code and/or data with correct entries for precision and recall for the four models. **3 POINTS**

5) Did they include some top-n recommendations for at least one user, for one value of n?

- Poor: They did not include any code or work at all. **0 POINTS**
- Good: They included some code, but did not correctly call the right functions to get the top movies for a particular user. **1 POINT**
- Very good: They included correct code and logic to generate the top-n predictions of movies for a user, with a reasonable value of n. **3 POINTS**

What aspects of this response stood out to you? What did it do well? How could it be improved?

>>> Enter your response on the online edX platform.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this peer review!