Zyliss Classic Cheese Grater
by Zyliss

561 customer reviews
3 answered questions

List Price: $17.99
Price: $15.99 Prime
You Save: $2.00 (11%)

In Stock.
Ships from and sold by Amazon.com. Gift-wrap available.

Style Name: Cheese Grater

25 of 28 people found the following review helpful

⭐️⭐️⭐️⭐️ Not very good for people with small hands, May 27, 2008

By Amanda S. "Verona"

Verified Purchase (What's this?)

This review is from: Zyliss Classic Rotary Cheese Grater (Kitchen)

I found it was easy to take apart and clean, but using it is a little bit awkward. In order to create enough pressure to grate quickly, I have to hold it higher up than it was designed (because my hands are smaller/weaker than it was designed for?) If I hold it like designed, the cheese isn't pressed into the grater as well and it takes a very long time to grate. This is my first parmesan grater of this style, so I don't know if other brands would have the same problem or not for me. I imagine it would easier for people with bigger/stronger hands.
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Built a dataset with:
- 4,000,000 reviews
- 700,000 products
- the largest review dataset
deviation from average = star rating – average star rating
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Alternative hypothesis:

- individual bias

You will consider a review helpful if it agrees with your personal opinion.
The effect of disagreement
What happens for different levels of disagreement ($\sigma^2$)?
What happens for different levels of disagreement ($\sigma^2$)?

- $\sigma^2=0$
- $\sigma^2=0.5$
- $\sigma^2=1$
- $\sigma^2=1.5$
- $\sigma^2=2$
- $\sigma^2=2.5$
- $\sigma^2=3$
- $\sigma^2=3.5$
- $\sigma^2=4$
What happens for different levels of disagreement ($\sigma^2$)?

- $\sigma^2=0$
- $\sigma^2=0.5$
- $\sigma^2=1$
- $\sigma^2=1.5$
- $\sigma^2=2$
- $\sigma^2=2.5$
- $\sigma^2=3$
- $\sigma^2=3.5$
- $\sigma^2=4$
What happens for different levels of disagreement ($\sigma^2$)?

low disagreement: “Go with the average”
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What happens for different levels of disagreement ($\sigma^2$)?

high disagreement: “Stay away from the average, and above”
**Overall**: as the disagreement increases, go *slightly above* the average

Except in Japan, where it’s best to be *slightly below*!
Just a correlate of textual quality?
Text-only hypothesis: helpfulness is evaluated purely on the basis of the text of the review (e.g., maybe NJ people do actually write better reviews?)

We would like to control for the actual quality of the text
Text-only hypothesis:
helpfulness is evaluated purely on the basis of the text of the review
(e.g., maybe NJ people do actually write better reviews?)

We would like to control for the actual quality of the text
Text-only hypothesis:
helpfulness is evaluated purely on the basis of the text of the review
(e.g., maybe NJ people do actually write better reviews?)

We would like to control for the actual quality of the text

1% of Amazon reviews are plagiarized! (see also David and Pinch ['06]).
Text-only hypothesis:
helpfulness is evaluated purely on the basis of the text of the review
(e.g., maybe NJ people do actually write better reviews?)

We would like to control for the actual quality of the text

1% of Amazon reviews are plagiarized! (see also David and Pinch ['06]).

Exactly what we need: reviews with almost identical text in different non-textual contexts!
7 of 11 people found the following review helpful:

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ Migraine Headache at No Extra Charge, May 28, 2004

By A Customer

If you enjoy a thumping, skull splitting migraine headache, then the Sing N Learn series is for you.

As a longtime language instructor, I agree with the effort that this series makes, but it is the execution that ultimately weakens Sing N Learn series. To be sure, there are much, much better ways to learn a foreign language. In fact, I would recommend this title only as a last resort and after you've thoroughly exhausted traditional ways to learn Korean.

26 of 30 people found the following review helpful:

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ Skull-splitting headache guaranteed!!, June 16, 2004

By A Customer

If you enjoy a thumping, skull splitting migraine headache, then Sing N Learn is for you.

As a longtime language instructor, I agree with the attempt and effort that this series makes, but it is the execution that ultimately weakens Sing N Learn Chinese.

To be sure, there are much, much better ways to learn Chinese. In fact, I would recommend this title only as a last resort and after you've thoroughly exhausted traditional ways to learn Chinese.
Text-only hypothesis: helpfulness is evaluated purely on the basis of the text of the review.

After controlling for the actual quality of the text, the same socially-based biases hold.