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Poster presentation and feedback

- Poster session
  - Practice presenting your work in a particular, restricted framework
    - Being brief is more difficult than not!
    - Forces you to boil it down to the essential message
    - Useful skill for posters, papers, talks, meetings, interviews,....

- You (PhD students) have prepared your posters
- You will present them here in mixed groups
- You (postdocs) get to review the posters and provide feedback

- Outcome: feedback for presenters, reflecting on reviewing for reviewers
What should go in?

- **Title**: brief, precise, catchy to attract attention
- **Author names, affiliation, email**
- **Introduction (no separate abstract)**
  - create interest
  - include only absolute minimum on background
  - be very explicit about novelty / contribution
- **Motivation**
- **Existing work**
- **Approach**
  - Core findings, ideas, solutions, etc.
  - (if applicable) experiment design and results
- **Lessons learnt**

Elements similar to paper structure
Structure

- Make it clear visually what the order is, provide structuring headings
- Break into short lists of texts or paragraphs, no long texts
  - Use columns, boxes, etc.
- Identify your most important aspects and make them stand out
Visual considerations

- Go for readability, clarity
  - Use clear titles
    - Summarize your content, create precise descriptions (not “Introduction”, not “Graph 1”)
  - If there is something you would like to highlight, do so
- Aim for illustrations that “tell the whole story”
  - To the extent possible, if someone just looks at the pictures, they should still get a feeling of what you did
The poster presentation

- Poster should also work without you
- Be prepared to give a full presentation of the poster in 3-5 minutes
  - Your audience might not know your particular research topic; or they might work on it themselves
  - Try to engage your audience (and do not talk to the poster)
The template

- Is the poster clearly structured, easily readable and aesthetically pleasing to the viewer?
- Is the content focused to the main messages, with clear explanations of goal and contribution?
- Do the figures (i.e., tables and graphs) convey the intended message?
- Without verbal explanation, can readers grasp the intent of the poster?
- Did the presenter convey the content in a logical, continuous manner, engaging the audience?
- In summary, how would you rate the poster presentation?
- Candidate for Best Poster Award?
How does this work now?

- Each PhD student has up to 7 minutes (including questions!!) to present their poster
  - Change posters when you hear the whistle!!
- We work in groups
  - Group allocations are put up in the room
  - Groups are mixed so that we have a diverse audience
- Postdocs take notes on the template sheets we hand out
  - We discuss among postdocs before giving feedback
Thank you.

Questions? Comments?

- A nice idea for future use
  - Put your poster on your office door
  - Used at MPI says Gerth
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Reviewing

- Your experience
- The good / the bad
- What I would wish there was in every review
Review

- What – brief summary (possibly incl. Judgement)
- Strong / weak points
  - Any work can be rejected
  - Look for reasons of acceptance
    - Even for reject, that’s the road to continue
    - Is the problem actually important / relevant?
- Balance with standards (what are these?)
  - Experience
  - Look at old proceedings / journal issues
  - Study the call
    - E.g. some workshops accept unfinished work
  - Ask your peers / host
- How to improve the paper
  - What would it take for the work to be accepted
  - Does it live up to its own claims?
- Good tone, talk about work, not authors
- Give reasoning for your judgement
- Authors cannot ask questions, so be concrete
How to work with reviews

- It’s a done deal
  - Often one would hope for more (time spent, more thoroughly read, better written, more detailed)
  - Can seem unjust
    - Might actually be
- Try to accept it, and work out the reasons
  - If they point out a minor detail, maybe they just did not like the work
    - Why were they not excited? Work on motivation / contributions
    - Is it not a detail? Think critically
    - How could they misunderstand? Work on explanations / descriptions
  - Any review reflects a point of view
The content of the review

- Some points are easy to understand
  - Fix or argue
- Some points are difficult to interpret
  - Discuss with peers / supervisor
  - Leave for a while and come back
  - Look into how to address these
  - For conferences – if you misunderstand, it might not be an issue, if it makes your work better
- Carefully address reviewer points
  - You may also choose not to change something, but it is often a good idea to then argue for your reasons in the paper
    - Avoid too specific add-ons for conference papers
Notes from the retreat –

Ideas for future postdoc events

- How to write a research proposal
  - How to write the grant
  - Understanding the grant environment in Denmark
  - Arrange as event
- Academic career counseling
  - Should I stay in academia or not?
- How do I integrate into industry from a PhD/postdoc?
  - Arrange event with people of different backgrounds to discuss pros and cons of industry and academia
- What is needed in order to get an academic position (at AU or elsewhere)?
- How do you do an academic interview? Preparing your documents for an application
- How do you do a literature search / review for your related work section? (mostly students, but also some postdocs)
- Supervising students (unofficially) at PhD or Master level
- Transition of going from TA to being in charge of teaching
  - Decide what is taught