Literature Presentation Feedback Form

Name: Andrew, Angela
Group Presenting: Glioblastoma Multiforme

1. What -omics did this group's papers focus on (clinical, genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic)?

Proteomic, transcriptomic, epigenomic

2. What was the main finding from this group's research paper?

Tumor recurrence is associated with a specific type of gene. The phenotype for this gene is inducible and also reversible.

3. What is one thing you learned about the group's cancer field from this presentation?

GBM has an incredibly low survival rate at 5%. The treatment pipeline is very one size fits all, beginning with surgical resection if possible then chemotherapy or radiation therapy. Not much personalized therapy.

4. What did you find the most interesting from this presentation?

I found it interesting that there was such a strong association between a tumor recurring and the phenotype shown by the mesenchymal cells.

5. What scientific questions can be further explored following this presentation?

How to personalize the treatment for GBM through the combination of targeting various molecular sites. How can the induced phenotype and its reversal be developed for treatment.

6. What did this group do well in the presentation?

I think the figures used for organizing the text on the slides were very helpful in creating a logical path.

7. What could be improved in this presentation?

Overall, a very strong presentation. I think some figures included in the review portion could help better illustrate some of the points about GBM.

Literature Presentation Feedback Form

Name: Peyton, Andrea, Jeanne, Rebecca
Group Presenting: Ovarian Cancer

1. What -omics did this group's papers focus on (clinical, genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic)?

transcriptomic, methylomic, genomic, proteomic

2. What was the main finding from this group's research paper?

To use various data points on Ovarian cancer patients and find associations with the disease to better give a prognosis on Ovarian patient cancer patients.

3. What is one thing you learned about the group's cancer field from this presentation?

Some experts consider there to be 4 types of ovarian cancer, while others believe that there can be 5 subgroups.

4. What did you find the most interesting from this presentation?

There were not any significant associations when analyzing the tumor cells. Most likely due to the variability in patient samples.

5. What scientific questions can be further explored following this presentation?

Better understand how different types of Ovarian cancer vary from each other. How to use our current understanding to personalize and develop better treatment for Ovarian Cancer.

6. What did this group do well in the presentation?

I think the group did a good job explaining all the various concepts presented in the research paper. I know there were a lot of parts and clusters and I appreciate the explanation of each.

7. What could be improved in this presentation?

Although important in judging the validity of the study, some of the information included in the methodology was not needed for understanding the results of the research paper. The explanation for some of the figures was hard to follow.

Literature Presentation Feedback Form

Names: Hunter, Lan, Anton
Group Presenting: Colorectal Cancer

1. What -omics did this group's papers focus on (clinical, genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic)?

Genomics- the research paper sought to identify DNA segments as a way to screen for the cancer
Methylomics- DNA methylations

2. What was the main finding from this group's research paper?

Early detection of the cancer through liquid biopsy.

3. What is one thing you learned about the group's cancer field from this presentation?

Liquid biopsy can help create targeted treatment for Colorectal Cancer.

4. What did you find the most interesting from this presentation?

I found it very interesting how many different parts can be changing during cancer. I also found it very interesting that through one technique we are able to identify so much information.

5. What scientific questions can be further explored following this presentation?

Further research into the specifics of liquid biopsy and how to improve its ability to detect colorectal cancer.

6. What did this group do well in the presentation?

This group had very well organized slides that was very well balanced in terms of words on page and images presented.

7. What could be improved in this presentation?

Very well presented and spoken. Less of the comments like "the end" would have made the presentation more formal

Literature Presentation Feedback Form

Names: Thomas, Erika, Nathan
Group Presenting: Endometrial Cancer

1. What -omics did this group's papers focus on (clinical, genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic)?

Genomic, methylomics, transcriptomic

2. What was the main finding from this group's research paper?

Epigenetic differences in endometrial cancer between black and white women. Hyper and hypo methylation is key in cancer studies. Racial disparities in cancer incidence. Can be related to certain biological markers.

3. What is one thing you learned about the group's cancer field from this presentation?

Very hard to spot endometrial cancer, must conduct more tests in order to diagnose it.

4. What did you find the most interesting from this presentation?

I thought it was very interesting that there was such a noticeable difference in methylation between women of different races. I wonder if men have any cancers with similar observations.

5. What scientific questions can be further explored following this presentation?

What kind of factors and processes are contributing to these differences in methylation between Black and White women. Is there a socioeconomic connection to what may be the difference seen between races.

6. What did this group do well in the presentation?

Very well spoken and I enjoyed the figures that were presented. I think it supported what was being said very well.

7. What could be improved in this presentation?

I think it was a little hard to understand what the review paper had talked about with the sudden transition into the research paper.