

## Evaluation criteria Immunobiology article presentations

| Criteria                                    | Evaluation   |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   | Not sufficient   | Sufficient   | Good  |
| Introduction to the problem                 | The introduction is missing or is very hard to follow. The problem addressed by the article is not clear.  | The problem addressed by the article is clearly presented. Might be lacking some necessary background information in the introduction that is necessary for this audience. Or some unnecessary information is given, e.g., function of a T cell. | The problem addressed by the article is clearly presented. It is clear why this is an interesting research question. All necessary details are presented to understand the concept. |
| Contact with the audience/understandability | The presentation is too slow/fast so that the audience loses interest. The presenter is mainly reading from her/his notes and is not able to reach the audience. | Most of the presentation is understandable to the audience. The presenter is using his/her body language at places to break a monotonous presentation.   | The presentation is clear as a whole. The presenter speaks loud and clearly, and is able to catch the attention of majority of the audience. It is a lively presentation.           |
| Relevance extra article                     | Not clear why this article was chosen.   | The relevance is clear, though it is maybe not the best choice.  | A really relevant and interesting additional article is chosen and explained clearly. Enough emphasis is put on the comparison with the original article.                           |

| Criteria                      | Evaluation   |   |   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
|                               | Not sufficient   | Sufficient  | Good  |
| Structure of the presentation | The duration is either too long or too short. The structure is unclear, consists mainly of small bits and pieces.              | The presentation has a clear structure. There could be repeats here and there, but as a whole it is easy to follow.                               | The presentation has a good structure. Different pieces follow each other in a logical way. Passages from one part to the other well done.                        |
| Form of the presentation      | The slides have too much text and complex and non-relevant figures.  | In some slides there is too much text, and few figures can be difficult to understand, but majority of the figures and slides are easy to follow. | The slides have a good ratio of text and figures. Some figures are specially adapted for this presentation. It is clearly cited where the figures are taken from. |
| Answering questions           | The presenter is not answering the questions, or it becomes clear from the answers that he/she did not understand the article. | The answers of the presenter are mostly correct/relevant and it becomes clear that he/she understood the main message of the article.             | It becomes clear during the discussion session that the presenter has a good background in the subject and had a good understanding of the article.               |