Best posters vote: (11), (25)

**Poster 27: Sneeze**

**Strength 1:** Very interesting topic. The very good highlighted panel in the middle column. The audience can see the main point right away!

**Strength 2:** Limitations from the experimental apparatus are discussed, which is that the trade-off of using a fish-eye lens can distort the image for proper tracking of sneeze front.

If I understand correctly, the reason we would you a fish-eye lens to image the trajectory is that it can capture a wider range of particles flying toward different places?

**Weakness 1:** The poster can perhaps be more informative by adding one or two figures showing the results or the quality of the parameter estimation like the ones in the method paper.

**Weakness 2:** Maybe have a lighter background color in the poster blocks (instead of this dark blue), such that the words within the blocks can be more obvious.

**Poster 28: DAS**

**Strength 1:** Very interesting idea of using traffic noise to locate the DAS channels. A strong formulation of the problem mentioned in the method paper

**Strength 2:** Nicely layout what are the model, data, objective function. That’s really helpful for me to understand how you tackle this problem.

**Weakness 1:** Are there validation truth values to compare with the Bayesian estimates? If yes, then the comparison between the Bayesian result and the truth is not clearly shown in the “Results section” on the poster. Or maybe there is no validation truth here to compare with the estimates?

**Weakness 2:** Maybe using larger fonts and thicker linewidths in your plots as well as the figures. I would prefer having similar font sizes for the main texts in the poster and the fonts in the plots. I guess that more comfortable to read.

**Poster 29: Fe-Ni-S alloy**

**Strength 1:** Clearly formulating the methods that are used to approach this problem.

**Strength 2:** Nicely mentioned the benefits and differences of using MCMC compared to the regular optimal estimation is that MCMC does not assume probability distribution.

**Weakness 1:** Maybe it would be good to say just a little bit more about why we would care about the parameters V, K, K’ in practice. For example, how we can apply them to know more about what kind of properties in the Earth’s core.

**Weakness 2:** For figures on the poster, maybe we can increase the font sizes. I would prefer having similar font sizes for the main texts in the poster and the fonts in the plots. I guess that more comfortable to read. Otherwise, nice and neat layout of the poster. Easy to track the key points.

**Poster 30: Exoplanet spectrum**

**Strength 1:** Clearly compared forward modeling versus retrieval modeling and mentioned their pros and cons, respectively. The presenter also clearly mentioned why the nested sampling method is preferred over the MCMC method due to the nature of multimodel probability distribution in this problem. So I think why the method is chosen is clearly stated.

**Strength 2:** Clear motivations and sounds interesting. The poster background is great.

**Weakness 1:** Within the poster content, it is not very clear from a non-professional standpoint that why the missing or the lacking physical parameter, in the end, is attributed to the effects of clouds. Perhaps shortly mention one of the models (the Sonora model) is cloud-free somewhere on the poster to highlight the limitations of this forward modeling method.

**Weakness 2:** On the poster, in the section with “Retrieval results versus Model grids,” the figures are not clearly explained with some texts or notes. So, I guess people who are not in this field, if they merely look at the poster, would have a hard time understanding what the presenter wants to convey via the figures in that section. Maybe add a few words beside the figure explain, especially the lower left figure in that section.