Presentation title: Parkinson's Detection with XGBoost

Presenter: Parker, Gounas

Instructions to reviewer: Use these criteria to rate the poster presentation on a scale of 1-5 (1=strongly disagree; 3=neutral; 5=strongly agree).

Appropriateness

The poster presents a topic relevant to the course?   No [Yes]

Appearance   **5 is strong agreement**

1. Presentation attracts viewer's attention.   1 2 3 [4] 5

2. Sentences are easy to read.   1 2 3 4 [5]

3. Presentation is well organized and easy to follow.   1 2 3 4 [5]

4. Graphics and other visuals enhance presentation.   1 2 3 [4] 5

5. The presentation is neat and appealing to look at.   1 2 3 4 [5]

Content

6. Content is clear and easy to understand.   1 2 3 4 [5]

7. Purpose of model is stated clearly.   1 2 3 [4] 5

8. Relevance clearly stated.   1 2 3 4 [5]

9. Key aspects of the topic are stated clearly.   1 2 3 4 [5]

10. There is enough detail about methods for me to understand the model and results.   1 2 3 [4] 5

11. The approach taken is in the R example is clear.   1 2 3 4 [5]

12. Presentation is free of unnecessary detail.   1 2 3 4 [5]

13. Conclusions are stated clearly.   1 2 3 4 [5]

14. Conclusions are supported by model results.   1 2 3 4 [5]

Presentation

15. Presenter's response to questions demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and project.

1 2 3 4 5

16. Overall, this was a great poster presentation.

1 2 3 4 5

Other comments (at least three cohesive sentences for your classmate)

The presentation was very well organized. The R code and the result of the code were clearly presented and easy to read as we listened. The only suggestion I have would be: to explain the choice of parameters, like 0.5, more explictly.