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## APPEARANCE

The design is visually appealing. The orange and blue color scheme matches Bucknell University’s colors.

The text and the figures stand out against the background.

The colors for the conditions are used consistently in Figures 2 and 3.

The text could be a little larger.

## SECTIONS

Each section has a descriptive heading.

The sections are clearly marked.

The sections flow naturally from top left to bottom right.

## BALANCE

There is more text than figures. The bulleted lists summarize the most important points. However, the extended blocks of text make it hard for the reader to grasp the important concepts quickly. The figures are large and legible.

## PROOFREADING

In the Methods, a word seems to be missing in this sentence: “…are accessible from the inside the tower.”

In the Discussion, I would need the presenter’s help in understanding which figure displays these data: “(a difference of approximately 110mg/ dL for short term vs only 40mg/ dL for long term).”

In the Discussion, *verses* should be spelled *versus*.
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## TITLE

The title accurately describes the research, but does not reveal the take-away message. However, the study may be too complex to summarize the main result in the title. Furthermore, this poster appears to be part of a series (see Methods), so we may not be able to grasp the “big picture” without having access to the other studies.

## AUTHORS

The authors’ names, affiliations, and contact information are provided.

## INTRODUCTION

The Background section relies heavily on prior knowledge from journal articles. Non-specialist visitors may need the presenter’s help to understand the connection between the bulleted items and why this study was done.

The research question is clearly stated in the Question and Hypotheses section. The hypotheses include a time component (long-term vs. short-term metabolite levels), but the question does not. Consider including a follow-up question to alert visitors to this additional variable.

Because of the number of variables studied, it is difficult to understand the connection between the two hypotheses and the research question. After having read the discussion, I think Hypothesis 1 could be reworded “Triglyceride levels will increase in food-supplemented chicks over the long term (days)” for clarity. Similarly, Hypothesis 2 could be reworded “Triglyceride levels are expected to spike immediately after feeding (minutes).”

If I were present at the poster session, I would ask the presenter if hypotheses were proposed for the other metabolites. I would also need the presenter’s help to understand the rationale for Hypothesis 2.

## METHODS

The methods are described concisely. The details would probably be easier to understand after hearing the talk and seeing the referenced poster.

## RESULTS

The results displayed in the bar graphs are easy to understand. To reinforce the numerical results, consider replacing “Experiment # (Timescale: x)” and the figure captions with the take-away message above each figure.

In Figure 1, is it important to specify how many days after supplemental feeding was initiated that these triglyceride levels were measured?

If I were present at the poster session, here are some questions I would have for the presenter:

Were similar measurements taken for cholesterol under and over 15 minutes?

Was there a correlation between plasma triglyceride concentration and plasma corticosterone level?

## CONCLUSIONS

The most important conclusions are summarized in the Discussion section.

The data generally support the conclusions. I would need the presenter’s help to understand which graph illustrates the “difference of approximately 110mg/ dL for short term vs only 40mg/ dL for long term” in triglyceride levels.

Explanations are proposed for the results.

There is a clear connection between the conclusions and the original objectives.