

## Grading report

Group evaluated: A

Evaluation by (Group, TA, or Prof.):  
Prof, TA, Groups B and C

Module #: 2  
Date: 5/11/25

Prof. Aleksandar Antanasijevic

### **Depth of understanding of the papers' content**

- Overall very good understanding of the content; well-investigated!
- The introduction was very clear, and the pros/cons of Cryo-EM and X-Ray crystallography were insightful to get a good general overview, especially for a beginner audience.
- However, try to avoid introducing topics that are not actively pursued in the paper (e.g., X-ray crystallography), as it steals attention from other concepts/topics that are closer to this paper's essence.

### **Level of understanding of the scientific field of the set of papers supported by additional literature search:**

- A great understanding of the scientific field, sufficiently to initiate a very rich discussion.
- Also, there was an objective, clear view regarding the potential applications.
- The propositions of new ideas at the end were overall solid and showed that there was extra research beyond just reading the paper and the reviews.
- It would have been nice to see a bibliography and a few more references/citations.

### **Quality of the presentation (slides):**

- Very nice slides, with clear schematics for the introduction and general method workflow.
- The slides were not too heavy with content, which made it easier to follow, but not at the expense of details.

### **Quality of the presentation (oral):**

- Very good, on time, fluid, and clear.
- Improved on the volume of speaking from the first presentation.
- There were 2 presenters that seem to rely a bit on written notes. Try to avoid this and practice the presentation until you can use the bullet-points on the slides as the only written reference you need.

### **Critical analysis, discussion and comparison of the presented set of papers:**

- Very good critical overview at the end.
- Missed a few minor points for criticism (e.g., discussing overall method efficacy) but that is understandable on this level.
- It was very good to see that the extra effort was made to propose modifications that could further improve the method and make it more broadly applicable.

MS in Bioengineering  
BIO467 Scientific Literature Analysis in Bioengineering

Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne

- One suggestion: Instead of waiting until the end to propose all the positive and negative criticism, you can try to do this throughout the presentation, and summarize all the criticism at the end.

**Quality of the answers given in response to the audience questions:**

- Clear, coherent and correct answers. Very good!  
- A few presenters did not contribute to the discussion (Q&A). Try to balance the participation in Q&A better during your future presentations.

**Additional optional comments:**

- Great improvement from the first presentation in simplifying the topic, and making it easy to understand.  
- Keep up with great work!