

## Grading report

Group evaluated: B

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

Module #: 2

Prof. Aleksandar Antanasijevic

Date: 5/11/25

### Depth of understanding of the papers' content

- The paper is quite complex so, taking that into account, the overall understanding was quite good.
- The potential use of these enzymes, as well as the methods and techniques used to evaluate them in this paper, were covered in sufficient detail.

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

- Overall, the background understanding was good but lacked depth in a few areas. For example, some additional background reading on protein design would have been useful to place these methods into the broader context.
- Additionally, a comparison to what is currently the standard in academic research and industry, would have really added a good frame of reference to better evaluate this work.
- Throughout the presentation there were many references. It showed that the group did a lot of extra research, which is appreciated.

### Quality of the presentation (slides):

- Overall, the slides were very nice and clear. It was great that you highlighted some parts to allow the audience to follow the presentation more easily. Good structure.
- The use of +/- system in methods and results was an excellent idea! Just try to be more consistent with it next time, because it seemed like it was used only for some sections.
- Occasionally some graphs are displayed but not used or explained. Try to make the most of the available slide space, and use animations to improve the overall flow of information.
- Anticipating questions and preparing the back-up slides was also an excellent idea.

### Quality of the presentation (oral):

- Presenting style was quite nice with good poise and rhythm.
- Went a bit over time so please try to be more punctual next time.
- While the tone was overall OK to understand and follow, a few presenters should try to speak a little louder for better comprehension
- Please avoid using notes and written text when presenting. Rehearse the presentation until you can comfortably explain everything. Use bullet-points on the slides to help remind you on the exact point you are trying to make.
- The fellow students were able to see improvements compared to the first presentation, which is a great sign moving forward.

Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne

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

- Balanced the critique well — not too negative about the paper and also highlighted its positive aspects, which was great to see.
- It was also nice that your review was not too influenced by the available peer-review files, but genuinely original.
- The financial analysis at the end was a very nice touch, and a clear illustration that the group made the extra effort.
- Missed a few minor points for criticism (e.g., mutant vs WT efficacy data) in the current work. To improve, try to really evaluate if the presented data quantitatively supports the claims being made in the paper.

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

- Overall, the group defended most of their arguments well, but sometimes lacked a bit of confidence and depth – very normal on this level.
- The group also anticipated some questions and had additional slides which enriched the discussion.

**Additional optional comments:**

- Pleasant presentation to listen to!
- Keep up with great work!