**Mentor Meeting 4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date: | 4 April 2018 |
| Time: | 3pm – 4pm |
| Venue: | SIS Meeting Room 4.5 |
| Attendees: | Joanne Ong Shi Ying  John Koh Wei De  Rachel Tay  Professor Kam Tin Seong |
| Absentees: |  |
| Agenda: | Feedback for Research Paper |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Details | Action By | Due Date |
| 1 | Questions   * Wilcoxon tests;   + Once we reject the null hypothesis, we can infer that the median in 2016 is higher/lower than 2017.   + Then we can conclude if it is effective or not. * Contingency analyses;   + Reject null hypothesis, then we can refer to the mosaic plot to infer if it is higher or not   + Are there signs of improvement? * See if they should increase another hour?   + Looking at 2016 and 2017 - if no signs of improvement then they shouldn’t increase. But if it has improved, they can possibly increase the the loan period and analyse the data after that. And compare if it helps or not. | All | - |
| 2 | Research Paper   * Refer to the sample research papers, pick up the skills of writing the paper * Introduction   + Don’t have to overemphasize on the client. Just say that we are using them as a study. * Motivation (Active users etc - shows that we might not be objective) - we have to stay neutral, don’t have to state our relationship with SMU. Redundant. Paraphrase in the 3rd party perspective. Try not to bring ourselves in too much. **We** found out that VS **this study** shows that etc * Remove the 2nd and 3rd paragraph. * Page 2 1st paragraph, last line - change it (short form??) * Provide overview of the paper - section one provides \_\_\_\_ , section two provides \_\_\_\_\_. A paragraph on it - Eg: Group 2 Paper Outline Paragraph * Missing literature review - focus on studies on course reserve/library loan management (less technical). * Different writing style - page 2-5 needs more elaboration * Not very strict on word count. 5k seems ok   + Can reduce the data preparation and focus on the analysis   + Data tables put in appendix   + Data and methodology should take up 3 paragraphs * Remember to define the hypothesis   + Put it before the results * Provide proper title   + 2 hours loan policy vs 3 hours loan policy   + VS   + Impact / Significance of 2 hours loan policy vs 3 hours loan policy * Describe what we observed (EDA) → null hypothesis → do normality test → non parametric test * Number of succession borrowings   + Structure is alright |  |  |

Meeting was adjourned at 4pm. These minutes will be circulated and adopted if there are no amendments reported in the next three days.

**Agenda for next meeting**

* Send another draft to Prof Kam to review once more.
* AP final presentation will be out this evening.

Prepared by,

John Koh Wei De

Vetted and edited by,

Rachel Tay