**Incognito**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Score** | |
| Story and analysis | 4.5 | /5 |
| Visualizations | 5.5 | /7 |
| Presentation | 2.5 | /3 |
| *Overall* | 12.5 | /15 |

Story and analysis

* Story is almost there: rathern than “Which category [of] influencers yields the maximum...engagement ROI”, why not say which category that is?
* Methodology could use more specifics, particular on how the categories are identified and what they are intended to represent. What is the purpose of using these tools? Why are they helpful in answering the research question?

Visualizations

* Always love a Sankey chart, but the connections widths don’t really make sense. It looks like the links between the influencer categories and the followers/retweets/likes are all equal width, but then the links to the topics are scaled, and are not in the same order.
* Given that the line widths sometimes represent magnitudes and sometimes don’t, I think it would have been better to put the category bar charts in between two Sankey charts, separating the influencer category side from the topic side. However, still not sure what the audience is supposed to take away from these bar charts.
* Why were these five topics chosen? They seem to represent a small percentage of retweets and likes, and I don’t understand what the connection is between total followers and these topics.
* I do not understand the sentiment analysis chart at all – it reports a frequency of “display names by category” which doesn’t seem to have any thing to do with sentiment.
* The annotation identifying the categories/keywords is helpful, but this should be something added to the visualization that shows this point, not just left in the corner.
* The visualizations have relatively consistent styles, though the use of color in the topic frequency chart confuses this. However, all visualizations use descriptive titles, leaving the audience to guess what they are supposed to take away.

Presentation

* Appreciate the simplicity and desire to focus attention, but probably need to break apart the single visualization into component pieces to make things easier to see and parse.
* Conclusions were pretty rote.
* Fair amount of reading from slides during the presentation, suggesting that more practice is needed.