Thomas Curran:

Overall design/layout: The overall design is very audience-friendly. Images, charts and tables are well-spaced, and the distribution of texts and graphs are well-balanced. Sections are clearly-labeled. It is especially helpful that you are having an arrow pointing to the problem you are addressing and highlighting your conclusion.

Visualization: You have a good variation of data visualization approaches. However, for tables, because the font size is relatively small, you should consider circling out a few statistics that you feel are important to capture the audience’s attention. There is quite a number of statistics in your table one and table two, so you might want to pick a few to highlight.

Content: This is a very meaningful project for education. It is nice that you used a sample report card in your introduction to provide the audience with the necessary information. For the methods section, classifying the dataset into elementary schools, middle schools and high schools to control for different characteristics is a nice way to improve accuracy. For qualitative features that are harder to capture, such as the change in leadership that you mentioned, you should probably create another few categorical variables. I am really amazed by the high accuracy of the Support Vector Machine Performance.

Joseph:

Overall design and layout:

The overall design is very neat and audience-friendly. The spacing of texts and graphs are well-balanced. Sections are clearly-labeled. The amount of text and the font is just right, making it easy to reading through. It is nice that you highlight your research question, names of the two datasets and the sentence summarizing your result in each section.

Visualization:

Graphs are clearly labeled and have proper titles. You used different colors for distinction between books and speech, and this differentiation stays consistent, which really makes the walk-through smooth. Book’s level complexity is clearly shown on your graph, capturing the audience’s interest. However, for the POS graph, you should consider circling out one or two POS on the x-axes that you feel are the most important, for example, circling out the “VBD” and the “VB” that you mentioned during the poster session. You probably would want to include the words that “POS” stand for in parentheses under your x-axes next to the “POS”.

Content:

This is a really interesting topic! It is nice that you gave a brief sentence to demonstrate the sentence structure and the way to calculate the depth and TTR. This example facilitates the audience understanding of your method. I think your measure of lexical diversity is very effective, and you really captured and quantified the difference between books and speeches!

Zhang Xiang:

Overall design and Layout:

Sections are well-organized and clearly labeled, and the spacing is well balanced. You have a great control over the number of texts and the spacing of graphs. The design of the poster makes the walk-through of your project flow naturally. You used italic to highlight your methods, which can easily guide the audience.

Visualization:

All plots have self-explanatory titles, are well-labeled, and have a legend when necessary. There is a good variety of types of plots. You have chosen the most effective types of plots for different purposes. The geographical distribution of Rank Correlation clearly shows area differences and captures my interest. The two tables are clear, but for improvement, I suggest that you circle or highlight some of the statistics that you feel are the most important or the most interesting.

Content:

It is a very meaningful topic in understanding inequality! The equations presented are clear, and not too complicated for the audience to comprehend. You introduced your measurements in a precise, comprehensive way. Your time series data covers a large time span, making it easier to capture trends. I am especially interested in the geographical pattern, and why the northern part has a higher correlation!

Yangyang Dai:

Overall design/layout: The overall design looks great. It has clear sections and highlighted brackets such as introduction, data to indicate relevant content. Each paragraph has a small arrow that makes information concise. I like the way that you present crime type comparison of the two cities. With graphs and results listed side by side, it makes your audience easy to comprehend.

Visualization: You have a good variety of graphs. Your graphs are clearly labeled and I really like the color that you use in your graphs. Black, red and grey not only bring a clear contrast to the audience, but also indicate your topic of crime. There are several improvements that I think you can make in visualization of your data. In the Exploratory Data Analysis section, you should add t on the x-axis of “Seattle crime by hour” graph to follow your explanation in the data section. Another thing is that for day of the week, if you use number 1 to 7 instead of 0 to 6, your audience can understand which day of week has the highest crime counts directly. Last by not least, you can potentially create more effective graphs by including both Chicago and Seattle’s data in one graph.

Content: It is a very interesting project; Seattle has always been on top of the list of cities that I want to live in the most. I can tell your project is very detail-oriented and I like the methods you used to explore crime type. The comparison between different models is clear and precise. The only thing that might be helpful to add is to include some crime types statistics in your poster.

Xiuyuan Zhang:

The overall Design and layout of this poster is fantastic. Audience can easily understand how this scientific experiment develops through the background, hypothesis, methods, task, and results. Each section is highlighted in red bracket and white text. Investigators presents a clear method that is logical and attractive for audience.

Visualization. I really like the visualization of the task part because it is really vivid and straightforward, making it easy for everyone to understand. One thing I would like to add is that since the method section is divided into two studies, the task section would be better if you could also mention which part belongs to study 1 and which part belongs to study 2. For the mean feature prevalence estimation graph, I think it would be more effective if three features are presented in three different graphs instead of just one graph, but only if you think necessary after checking the results.

Content: I enjoy exploring this topic and I think it would be a great idea to make a kids-friendly version and let children do this experiment. Another point that I suggest you to consider is whether repetition of the questioning process in study 2 would affect participants’ judgement. It is helpful to mention whether these 150 participants are given only one novel category each or three novel categories.