Mira’s notes on the second version of the poster

* I’d be careful of any text/images that are too close to the margins (concerned that the right side images will get cut off in printing). X
* You may try to fully justify the text in each column – it may be more visually appealing.
* Font sizes of your captions should be consistent. x
* Fig 5 captions… a) and b) currently have the same caption. Please distinguish with more descriptive text. x
* Fig 4 caption and fig 5 caption, perhaps distinguish which plots are coming from ‘in situ’ measurements from your field season, and from the long-term aws station data.
* Data Sources, when listing A and B, you can remove the period after each. So its just A) & B) x
* Caption for Fig 2, I would re-write to

*Fig 2: Map of the Juneau Icefield (Fig 2a) showing the Taku A (Fig 2b), Taku b (Fig 2c) and Heather iButton temperature sensor transects deployed along the icefield (Fig 2d) July 2023. X*

* Acknowledgements, please rewrite the part about funding to: …to Bates and Carlton Colleges and Harvard University for AGU travel support…x
* Instead of ex, use e.g. x

Daniel’s notes:

* I put in some guides to help with aligning the sections (View -> Guides)
* The columns don’t need to be in 3rd’s. You could make the middle one bigger to scale up the plots. I think you still have room to make the text smaller & still have it be readable.
* 2nd’ing Mira’s recommendation with making summary & background more distinct. For summary, you could have something to the effect of: i) We used iButton temperature sensors to measure local lapse rate on the Juneau Icefield ii) Rates among locations vary from 2.8 C/km - 8 C/km. These represent more variability than suggested by the long-term whole-icefield lapse rate calculated from weather stations. iii) Constraining variability in diurnal and seasonal lapse rates and understanding the effect of local factors are important goals for future mass-balance assessments on the Juneau Icefield. x
* For background, there are a couple spots that currently mention local effects you could pull together. The one under results does a good job of explaining the problem and why this work helps solve it! You can probably cut the 1st point in the background section and just start with the 2nd one. The first point in the summary section would also make a great 1st point in the background section. x
* Also 2nd’ing distinguishing in the captions which plots are made with weather station data vs. iButton. x
* In the 1st point under results, you could add that you also observed shallower lapse rates as well as steeper ones. x
* Make sure all the lapse rates have a negative in front! x
* Make sure the plots are exported in as high a resolution/dpi as possible, then scaled down to put on the plot. This will help immensely at the printer so they don’t come out grainy. Exporting as SVG would also do it. There is also a setting in word (not sure about slides) to not apply image compression to the images in the document.
* You could get some extra space by cutting down each reference a bit. They do this in some of the shorter-form journals. Here is an example from Nature Geoscience: x  
  