

1. In future, for such a high profile presentations, I would encourage you to dress a little more sharply. That doesn't have to mean a suit, but a better cut sports jacket that i) has more structure/heft and ii) is made of a material that does not easily wrinkle (I think the J crew blazer has some linen which is the worst material for that).
2. For my taste, I think a little more sign posting, previewing of the arguments you are going to make will help people follow and retain information. It's a very subtle paper, I think people need help conceptualizing.
3. I might consider moving the cost analysis up, perhaps even including it briefly in the motivation. Then it doesn't seem like as much of an after thought when you do the cost benefit interpretation of the results later.
4. Make it seem like social workers cannot really benefit from algorithm, that algorithm can only be useful because it can identify a population which we want to treat at some future point. I thought earlier narratives emphasized that social workers were too conservative, and this might help them efficiently target?
5. I thought Jen's comment about how the next research frontier is identifying the at risk men who "want to change" was not very clear/ot well phrased. It seems that your paper has provided one option to identify participants with high potential treatment effects--use social workers as a black box to pick them. Alternatively, this question could be what do social workers know/observe that suggests a participant would benefit/be receptive to READI, and, once we know those things, can we provide/accelerate them? It seems like the black box of social work could encompass far more than an individual's personal will/desire/motivation to "change." E.g. Social worker knows that Johnny has to spend time taking care of his grandmother, who is on the other side of town from the CBT meetings, or social worker knows that Ben has an older brother whose influence will dominate any program effects, or Billy is considering moving to another state, etc.) I think attributing it to personal desire for change sounds a little normative? Probably not what she meant, but you get what I mean.
6. Second bullet on "Costly to help, but more costly not to" slide is important, but abstract. Consider adding a visual/changing language/explaining better.
7. Graph axis for the long term results preview are confusing. The first two plots are chronological (i.e. 1-20, 20-40) which makes sense. But then the reader is primed to think that the third plot will also be a chronological continuation (i.e. 40-60), which it is not (it's the aggregate 1-40 month effect). Consider changing the colors on the bars for the aggregate, or putting it on the row below.
8. Extension idea:"How the sausage is made" or "Making of READI." Jen made some great points about the non-research challenges. It would be really interesting (and, potentially politically savvy) to write a short post-mortem/meta study that discusses some of these challenges you faced in READI, what your response was, and what you would do differently if you had a mulligan with that particular problem. You could organize these thematically and generalize up a 'best practices' kind of guide for people doing RCTs. I am not sure what the outlet would be, but I am sure there is one (maybe JEP, or that AEA proceedings, or even an RCT type publication). The advantages would be

1) marginal work low (no original research, just reflective writing, and you could probably have Jen write a lot of it); 2) second shot at drawing attention to READI; 3) potential for high visibility/citation (especially if Jen decides to promote it); 4) it's a good/unique thing on your CV since it almost has a service quality to the field; 5) you'd get to memorialize explicit or implicit criticism of Andy P; 6) it might prove cathartic.