Checklist for Review of Dataset
(Version 1)

> We recommend that students or employees wishing to publish on their data and results for a given research project in the form of a dataset asks a fellow student or colleague to review this dataset with regard to the points in this checklist. The purpose of the checklist ist to ensure that all data that can be made available is made available, that all analyses were conducted conscientiously by the researchers, that all results are reported accurately, and that all methods are transparent and sufficiently clear to be reproducible.
>
> If you choose to have your code reviewed according to this checklist, we advise you to upload this document together with your dataset to the research data repository of your choice (e.g. 4TU Research Data) upon publication of your work.

I. Basic Data

Paper title:	Collaboratively Setting Daily Step Goals with a Virtual Coach: Using Reinforcement Learning to Personalize Initial Proposals
Name(s) of researcher(s):	
Name of the reviewer:	Bouke Scheltinga
Data repository platform (e.g. 4TU Centre for Research Data):	

II. Checklist

Statement	Yes	No
1. The dataset contains a README file that fulfils the requirements of the data repository platform that the researcher wishes to use. If no such requirements can be found, the dataset nonetheless contains a README file that clearly explains the contents of the dataset?	X	
2. Either within the README file or within an extra, easily findable file, the researchers have explained their data. This means that, for example, for every column of a tabular dataset, all column names and possible cell values are explained.	X	
3. All data is in readily readable file formats. If this should not be the case, the README (or similar) clearly explains the file format and which software can be used to access the contents.	X	
4. All data has been anonymized in accordance to promises made in the Data Management Plan.	X	
5. The analysis file or files contain a header with meta-data (name of author, date of writing, required input files and generated output files).		X
6. All required input files for the analysis are available in the dataset.	X	
7. There is an output file that is generated by the analysis script that neatly combines code and commentary (e.g. markdown output file). This output file is in a readily readable file format (e.g. pdf).	X	
8. The analysis script is clean and comprehensible in the sense that: • There is sufficient, useful, and clearly written commentary	X	

Statement	Yes	No
• Irrelevant code (such as old analyses) has been removed • The details of analyses that are not reported in the paper (e.g. assumption checks) are proportional to those that are reported in the paper. This means that unreported analyses should not clutter up the script, making it long and unreadable.	X	
9. The analysis script can be run successfully.	X	
10. All preprocessing steps are clearly described and traceable, especially when preprocessing code cannot be executed because raw data is not available.	X	
11. The analyses and results reported in the manuscript can be found back in the analysis script with labels according to where they appear in the manuscript.	X	
12. All results reported in the manuscript accurately correspond to the output produced by the analysis script.	X	

III.   Additional comments by reviewer

Please state any additional things you noticed in reviewing the dataset or possible points of improvement for the reviewer.

Checklist item 5: not all analysis files contain a header with meta-data. Check /scripts/pre-processing.py, files in Data_and_analysis\analysis_code and Data_and_analysis\bayesian_analysis_steps\bayesian_analysis_steps.Rmd

When trying to run the scripts within the Docker container, I experienced that the files should be on the C drive to be found. This was indicated for the analyses in R, but is also true for the Jupyter Notebooks.

IV.   Review log

Round	Date	Paper Status	Checklist Items	Signature Reviewer	Signature Researcher
1	21-11-2023	Pre-submission	1-12		