

## Grading report

Group evaluated: D

Evaluation by (Group, TA, or Prof.):  
Prof, TA, Groups E and F

Module #: 2  
Date: 29/10/25

Prof. Aleksandar Antanasijevic

### Depth of understanding of the papers' content

- Overall, very good understanding of the content, methods and outputs of the paper.
- Some small mistakes in the introduction but correctly identified the main motivation behind the work and the experimental constraints.
- The experimental sections and results were explained clearly. Some relevant details were explained less well but this is also imposed by the time limit.

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

- The group cited many additional papers and provided comparisons with other relevant methods
- The presentation provided the necessary details to place this work in broader context (other methods, pathogens, applications).
- Sometimes, the depth in understanding different methods was lacking, but this is normal for non-experts in the field.

### Quality of the presentation (slides):

- Good slide quality throughout, excellent structure of the presentation, and very good explanations.
- The introduction needed a bit more clarity, although it correctly introduced all the important concepts. Always make sure that (1) the main problem the paper is attempting to solve and (2) the reason why this is relevant, are crystal-clear from the start.
- Some slides had a lot of text. Please work on optimizing the figure to text ratio in the future presentations.

### Quality of the presentation (oral):

- Easy to follow and very clear. Good flow throughout the presentation and consistent between presenters.
- Work on engaging the audience while presenting. Use your body language while explaining data. Don't be afraid to walk around on stage and point to data panels.

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

- The presentation per se was not sufficiently critical (both in a positive or negative sense). Try to address this next time and really attempt to evaluate the paper (not just present it).
- The group made a good comparison to other similar methods, thereby allowing to put this approach into a broader context. Well done!

Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne

- The Q&A session was very engaging and the group discussed the limitations and strengths of the paper; thereby compensating for a rather light criticism made during the talk.
- It was also excellent to see the entire team participating in the discussion.
- Given the age of the paper, it would have been good to have more discussion about the number of citations and the follow-up work from the same groups.

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

- Very coherent discussion with good answers overall.
- Long discussion, but the group managed to provide answers, sometimes with the help of the professor.

**Additional optional comments:**

Keep up with great work!