

<i>Description</i>	<i>Deduction</i>
General issues: Spelling and grammar	0.025
Writing style	0.025
Question	0.1
Results, discussion of Travis CI. No comparison of popularity of direct code modifications (commits) with indirect code modifications (pull requests) as opposed to the entire collection of projects	0.2
Wrong statement	0.25
Results, discussion of the GitHub data. No discussion of popularity of direct code modifications (commit) vs. indirect code modifications (pull requests) in all projects identified (considered as a whole).	0.25
Results, discussion of the GitHub data. No discussion of commit/pull request differences between projects written in different programming languages	0.25
General issues: Capitalization.	0.025
Methodology: No discussion of commits with wrong dates (e.g., those in 2038); query depending on the number of commits during the last month does not eliminate those.	0.1
General issues: Bibliography and references	0.05
Results, discussion of Travis CI. No comparison of popularity of direct code modifications (commits) with indirect code modifications (pull requests) in the Travis CI collection	0.2
No discussion of the chi-squared residuals.	0.15
Methodology: Project members are the only contributors considered.	0.2
Methodology: Not all constraints have been taken into account (per omission)	0.3
Methodology: Committers are the only contributors considered.	0.2
Differences in popularity of Travis CI in Java, Python and Ruby community can also be at least partially attributed to the fact that Travis CI has been launched in early 2011 as a service for the *Ruby* community, while support for Java and Python has been added later on, on February 21, 2012 and February 27, 2012, respectively.	0.1
Unsupported statement	0.25
Results, discussion of Travis CI. No discussion of differences in commit/pull request for different programming languages	0.2
General: The use of future tense in scientific writing is usually limited to activities you envision, e.g., when discussing future work, while in the main part of the report you are discussing activities that already has taken place. Hence, for example, you should write "we use GHTorrent" instead of "we will use GHTorrent".	0.05
Background: Discussion of GitHub and Travis CI has been literally taken from the assignment.	0.4
Threats to validity: No discussion of threats to validity	0.5
Methodology: wrong query. means that the build is older than one month while the intention is to calculate the number of changes during the last month.	0.15
General: Font and layout	0.05
General: Capitalize classes of numbered objects: "As shown in Figure 1", "In Section 2 we discuss", etc.	0.05
Document organization	0.05
Wrong terminology	0.15
Results: the use of means with no discussion of distribution shape (mean is known to be unreliable for highly skewed distributions)	0.5
Results, statistical analysis. No discussion of differences between repositories with different numbers of contributors wrt the impact of the way code modification is submitted on the build success/failure	0.2
Results, statistical analysis. No discussion of differences between repositories with different numbers of changes last month wrt the impact of the way code modification is submitted on the build success/failure	0.2

Results, statistical analysis. No discussion of differences between repositories of different age wrt the impact of the way code modification is submitted on the build success/failure	0.2
Results, projects that did not have enough data to be subjected to statistical analysis. No discussion of differences between projects developed in different programming languages	0.15
Results, projects that did not have enough data to be subjected to statistical analysis. No *explanation* why a certain cell in the contingency table was usually the one with less than five instances	0.15
Results, discussion of Travis CI. No explanation of differences in popularity of Travis CI for projects in different programming languages.	0.15
Results, discussion of Travis CI. No explanation of differences in popularity of direct code modifications (commits) with indirect code modifications (pull requests)	0.15
Methodology: it is not clear how the constraint has been taken into account (exact computation is not shown)	0.25
Methodology: Commits are the only changes considered.	0.2
LaTeX error	0.05
Inconsistent statements	0.25

