

**8) Were the talks on the appropriate difficulty level for you? 1=too easy, 5=too difficult**

Question	1	2	3	4	5	#
8.1 Less is more, let's build a spaceship! - Harald Achitz	2.70% (1)	24.32% (9)	67.57% (25)	5.41% (2)	0.00% (0)	37
8.2 Type safe flags - Arvid Norberg	0.00% (0)	27.03% (10)	67.57% (25)	5.41% (2)	0.00% (0)	37
8.3 GPU Computing and Image Processing with boost::compute - Richard Spindler	21.62% (8)	27.03% (10)	37.84% (14)	10.81% (4)	2.70% (1)	37
8.4 Expression tree transforms - Dominic Jones	0.00% (0)	2.78% (1)	19.44% (7)	47.22% (17)	30.56% (11)	36

**9) How valuable was it for you to see the talks? 1=gave me nothing, 5=very valuable**

Question	1	2	3	4	5	#
9.1 Less is more, let's build a spaceship! - Harald Achitz	5.41% (2)	24.32% (9)	32.43% (12)	35.14% (13)	2.70% (1)	37
9.2 Type safe flags - Arvid Norberg	0.00% (0)	21.62% (8)	32.43% (12)	32.43% (12)	13.51% (5)	37
9.3 GPU Computing and Image Processing with boost::compute - Richard Spindler	32.43% (12)	29.73% (11)	24.32% (9)	8.11% (3)	5.41% (2)	37
9.4 Expression tree transforms - Dominic Jones	22.22% (8)	27.78% (10)	33.33% (12)	13.89% (5)	2.78% (1)	36



13) Any feedback to Dominic Jones: Expression tree transforms

#	Response	Count	Percent
1	- Very interesting topic. It reminds me a bit the talk "Reactive Equations from André Bergner". Although, depending on your audience, you may want to spend more time on explaining expression templates before diving into your own code.	1	6.67
2	Super interesting topic, but maybe not a good match for the setup. At least in Sthlm it was difficult to read ye slides. Would love to revisit in a smaller venue where questions come more naturally.	1	6.67
3	This was well beyond my understanding and I didn't know what the motivation was for Dominic's endeavour. I would really have benefitted from a bit more time spent on introducing the problem he was trying to solve. I would have been able to get more out of the rest of the talk that way. I felt a bit left behind on this one.	1	6.67
4	Incredibly difficult to follow because of the nature of the talk, but that's not a negative really.	1	6.67
5	Thank you for the interesting talk.	1	6.67
6	Highly challenging topic to talk about. I appreciate Dominic skimmed over the details for better accessibility and yet managed to present the most relevant takeaways!	1	6.67
7	Very interesting. Some people didn't know the reasoning behind the code. I had some problems myself. It is definitely a topic for a longer talk (with the proper introduction of a problem).	1	6.67

#	Response	Count	Percent
8	It was difficult to follow because there was too little lead in. But nevertheless interesting.	1	6.67
9	I don't believe everyone in the audience knew what "differentiation" was. I talked to some people afterwards that basically were lost because they didn't understand that the purpose of all this was to create the derivative function of another function. I recognize a complicated template meta-programming problem quite dense and not very suitable for slides. Perhaps a better approach of explaining it is to just illustrate it. e.g. visualize the kinds of transformations you perform on the tree, rather than showing code. Just assert it's possible to write meta programs to do it, or something.	1	6.67
10	A better intro on the purpose of the work would have been helpful, a lot of people were lost due to the unfamiliar terminology and techniques.	1	6.67

