

Comparative Phylogeography of Four Hawaiian Damselfly Species

Jordan, Olaf, Carle, Englund, Foote, Simon, Parsons

Presented at the Evolution 2004 meeting in Fort Collins, Colorado

Layout and Appearance		
Criteria	Positive	Negative
<p>APPEARANCE: Is the poster neatly constructed? Do the text and the figures stand out against the background? Are colors and fonts used consistently? Is the text large and legible from 3-6 ft away?</p> <p>SECTIONS: Does each section begin with a descriptive heading? Is there sufficient space between sections? Do the sections naturally flow from top left to bottom right?</p> <p>BALANCE: Is there a nice balance between text and figures? Is there too much text?</p> <p>PROOFREADING: Is the text free of typos and grammatical errors?</p>	<p>Poster made with PowerPoint® looks professionally done.</p> <p>Text and figures stand out against the background.</p> <p>Font is large and legible.</p> <p>Consistent color scheme helps keep the damselfly species straight.</p> <p>Layout flows in rows from top left to bottom right.</p> <p>The non-traditional section headings (The question, The players, The stage, The data, and The conclusions) are attention-grabbing and effective.</p> <p>Good balance between text and figures.</p> <p>No obvious typos.</p>	
Content		
Criteria	Positive	Negative
<p>TITLE: Does the title grab your attention?</p> <p>AUTHORS: Are the authors' names, affiliations, and contact information provided?</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: Were the objectives clearly stated? Do you understand why this study was done? Did you get enough background information to understand the system? Were any abbreviations defined for the general visitor? Were the hypotheses rational?</p> <p>METHODS: Were the methods described clearly and concisely?</p> <p>RESULTS: Were the graphs easy to understand? Were any graphics distracting?</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS: Do the conclusions match the data? Are reasonable ideas put forth to explain the observed patterns? Is there a clear connection between the conclusions and the original objectives?</p>	<p>Authors and affiliations are provided.</p> <p>Background information is summarized in "The question" section. References are provided.</p> <p>Species characteristics are summarized using bulleted list.</p> <p>Results are a summary of DNA sequencing data. Text next to each figure helps with data interpretation.</p> <p>There is a clear connection between the original objectives and the results and conclusions. The conclusions are supported by the data.</p>	<p>Title does not hint at the results.</p> <p>Technical terms¹ ("Maximum Parsimony," "Maximum Likelihood," "heuristic and bootstrap searches," and "Bayesian analysis") are not defined for the layperson.</p> <p>Methods are not described.</p> <p>Acknowledgments are not given.</p>

¹ The first author comments that virtually all of the scientists at this large professional society meeting were familiar with the technical terms and methods. He wanted to emphasize the story, rather than the methods, and make it easy to follow.