Compiled jury comments from the GSGS Research conference 2015

General impression of the posters
What I found missing from many of the posters was placing the work in context, i.e. the Big Picture. The introduction should give some background of the field and state why the work is important. For many posters, I read the introductions and asked myself "Why are they doing this and why is it important?" So for me a good poster showed:

Brief introduction to field -> what I am doing -> why it is important -> my results -> my conclusions.

All the winners satisfied these criteria.

Many posters also lacked a "conclusion". Sometimes for works in progress (e.g. Ph.D.) the student may not have a conclusion. In this case one should just give preliminary results and an outlook of what is to be done in the future with this work. Many just presented what they are doing without a "bottom line" which kind of left it "hanging" with no "wrap up".
The 3 winners clearly did not have these weaknesses.

Overall the visual presentation for most of the posters was quite good - I was impressed.

Another comment for some posters: bullets are not text. Yes, it is good to minimize text, but bullets emphasize text and do not replace it. There should be some introductory text to the bullets.

Praise for **Matthias Thienemann's** poster:
- It nicely used only figures to illustrate what he wanted to convey. You almost did not need to read the text.
- Very appealing because of its clarity: not too much text – only the essential information; also the right font (not too small/large) with enough white space.
- Very good graphics: especially the timeline with pictograms was very nice. The pictograms were explained next to the graph in a bulleted list and provided an easy interpretation of the main results.
- Structure was very coherent and logical. Clear introduction with research goals. Then study area (with good maps and not overloaded with other info), short info on methods, then the picture with results and finally the conclusions and some basic references.
- Colors: soft ones so you don't get a headache by looking at screaming colors.
- The main plus of the poster was certainly the use of pictograms to frame the results – this was genius.

Praise for **Pia Friend's** poster:
- I liked it for its simplicity, clarity and good structure.
- The second place winner presentation was also good: nice introduction to the field, its importance, the measurements, the results, and a nice conclusion.

Praise for **Kathrin Schneider's** poster:
- The third place had a nice introduction and had a good visual presentation.
- After just half a year!