

## Grading report

Group evaluated: F

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

Module #: 2  
Date: 29/10/25

Prof. Aleksandar Antanasijevic

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

- Understanding of the manuscript was on a very high level. The team introduced quite well the molecular challenges of engineering nanopores.
- The experimental methods were not discussed in detail but that's understandable because of the presentation's duration limit.
- The discussion of results and outputs was somewhat light. While this is also understandable, detailed analysis into the results would allow for more comprehensive evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of this paper.

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

- They covered the sequencing techniques, introduced nanopore-based sequencing, and explained the need for custom nanopores – all in an excellent way.
- Good understanding of the overall context, with discussion of what was done before **and after** in this field.

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

- Slides were clear and not too dense. The topics were introduced in optimal order for audience to follow.
- The figures allowed to understand well how the nanopores were engineered.

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

- Nicely explained and very engaging.
- The pace was perfect with good diction from most speakers.
- Some speakers were reading too much from the tablet or slides. Please work on reducing this in the upcoming presentations. Practice until you don't need any text support.

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

- The group pointed out several largely positive sides of the presented work, but did not perform a detailed critical analysis of the paper.
- Even during the Q&A session, the impression was that the group did not have strong critical feedback regarding this work, and needed some guidance in answering.
- Of course this is normal for non-experts, but please try to emphasize this critical aspect during your upcoming presentations.

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

MS in Bioengineering  
BIO467 Scientific Literature Analysis in Bioengineering

Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne

- Very good answers to sometimes tough questions. The answers were mainly precise, but sometimes a bit incomplete or qualitative.
- Everyone participated in the discussion which is excellent.

**Additional optional comments:**

Keep up with great work!