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| Layout and Appearance |

## APPEARANCE

The design is visually appealing.

The text and the figures stand out against the background.

The text could be a little larger.

## SECTIONS

Each section has a descriptive heading.

The sections are clearly marked.

The sections flow naturally from left to right and top to bottom.

## BALANCE

There is a nice balance between text and figures. However, the extended blocks of text make it hard for readers to grasp the important concepts quickly.

The figures are large and legible.

## PROOFREADING

In the Abstract, “less telomeric repeats” should be “fewer” because *repeats* are countable nouns.

“…lineages share many traits in common” is redundant. Replace *share* with *have* or delete *in common*.

In the Background, “less telomere sequences” should be “fewer.”

In the Background, “Work…report that” is not grammatically correct.

In the frequency graph in the Methods: Telomere Distributions section, what is the difference between the blue and yellow lines. Is a legend required?

In the graphs in the Methods: Species and Analyses and Results and Discussion sections, shouldn’t the axes have tick marks?

|  |
| --- |
| Content |

## TITLE

The title accurately describes the research, but does not reveal the take-away message. Consider rewording to emphasize the most important finding.

## AUTHORS

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

## INTRODUCTION

The Abstract provides a good overview of the study, but takes time to read. Because all the information in the Abstract is repeated in the other poster sections, consider deleting this section.

Sufficient background information is provided to understand the system.

The objective is clearly stated.

## METHODS

Abbreviations are defined.

The name and purpose of the assay are given, but I would need the presenter’s help to understand the approach. If I were present at the poster session, here are some questions I would have for the presenter:

How is the gel image related to the frequency graph?

Are the graphs for *Taeniopygia guttata* representative of the graphs for all the species tested?

Which 16 species were tested? There are more than 16 species on the phylogenetic tree and on the gel images below. What do the numbers in parentheses after the species names mean?

How do you interpret the gel images?

How are kurtosis and skew quantified from the gel images?

What is the purpose of the equation on the graphs? Is the intent to predict one variable by knowing or measuring the other?

## RESULTS

The graphs are easy to understand. Writing the take-away message above each graph reinforces the numerical results.

I would need the presenter’s help to understand how she controlled for phylogeny?

## CONCLUSIONS

The most important conclusions are summarized in the Results and Discussion section under each figure.

The data support the conclusions.

Explanations are proposed for the results. I would need the presenter’s help to understand what she means by “better telomere maintenance”? I would be curious to know what molecular mechanisms might allow birds to achieve better telomere maintenance.

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