

Peer Review Shannon, Section 4.

Francesca Matano

Section 4

In this Section you describe this new model called “Posterior biasing”, that is a model you came up with, from mixing two other models you tried in the first part of the ADA (if I got it correctly). You then splitted the section in two subsections where you described both results and frequentists properties of your model.

I think the paper is structured very well. I like the way you splitted in subsections and the way you named them. It’s very easy to get from the title what you are going to describe and this makes the reader’s life much easier, since he/she can go thru whatever he/she is interested in.

In more details, I found a lot of abbreviations in this section, but I think that all of them make actually sense, since they were previously introduced. Like Brian said in class I would get rid of some of the words like “Promisingly” and “Encouragingly”, just for letting the reader be free to interpret the results. I found the same use in the Frequentist Properties subsection, with the adverb “Amazingly”. In this case, I would use something like “Surprisingly” since it’s something you didn’t expect or required your model to satisfy, but it’s a nice property that your model has and that the reader should notice.

Overall the section is very well written and easy to follow. I liked a lot the strategy of rephrasing concepts. I’ve notice that you start with the technical explanation and then you rephrase it to make it more intuitive.

Other comments

After equation (3) I would either get rid of the space before “or..”, or I would split the sentence in something like: “eq(3). More specifically, we weigh....”.

Adverbs : “Promisingly”, “Encouragingly”, “Amazingly”. Like I said I would use less enthusiastic adverbs, even if I agree that many of these results are very cool!!!