

1) I recently attended this talk and thoroughly enjoyed it.

The talk has a short and concise intro, it, then, goes to present the **story** of internet voting and does so in a captivating way. It presents **complicated material at the right level of detail** and abstracts away the unnecessary stuff. The talk also has a nice property that **it answered questions I had as the talk progressed**, which means the speaker thought of these topics from the POV of the listener and came back to those that warranted more discussion. The speaker's cadence during the talk is also enjoyable to listen to.

(It's likely not the best talk I attended, but one that came to mind.)

- Great difference between the formal writing in the paragraph and clearly informal comment in the brackets at the end.
- Style comment: "POV" use - abbreviations in formal texts are typically avoided unless introduced first or absolutely clear to the readers and having no possible double explanations ...POV is seemingly OK, however, in a formal context, it can be surprising

2) (A very light invited talk from this year Eurocrypto conference. I struggled with finding a good formal online talk)

The talk is about the relationship of cryptographers to mathematicians and communication between these groups. The reason I remember this talk is the way the speaker used research stories and book references (including pictures) to illustrate the main arguments about communication and community. The speaker speaks clearly and starts with answering one of the most important information for the speakers: "what can I learn from this."

-great!

3) This presentation about reinforcement learning starts with an interesting motivation, which attracts attention. It is organized in a logical sequence and easy to follow. The lecturer speaks clearly, and his body language, as well as eye contact, is appropriate. All of the materials, including questions for students, are prepared in advance and help understand the topic. After watching this video, I started to think about future applications of these theories in my research.

-great!

Style comment: "are prepared in advance and help ..." there is a stylistic tendency to use the same tenses or voices within one sentence (grammatically, there is nothing wrong with that, it just sounds nicer), so, stylistically, it might be better to divide the sentence: "All of the materials, including questions for students, are prepared in advance. They help understand the topic."

4) The speaker speaks clearly, uses a lot of illustrations and highlights the important parts, so while the technical parts are there for those who are interested, one can more or less skip them and still not get lost. It has a rather clear logical structure.

-great!

5) Very clear and efficient introduction, signposting, comforting body language (walking around confidently with a natural pace). In this case, slightly exaggerated intonation and work with volume seems to be an appropriate way of holding attention and focus on key parts of speech.

-great! Slightly informal style.

Style comment: the first one is not a sentence.

6) I recently came across this talk about clustering. The speech was very clear, captivating and easy to understand. Even though half of the presentation the speaker only summed up different well-known approaches to clustering, it was not boring. I also really enjoyed the way he presented the experimental results, which is something I usually struggle with.

-great! Slightly informal style.

7) I recently watched this presentation ..., which I considered well performed.

The talk is about a new type of multi-signature. It begins with a brief introduction of the relevant background, which enables to catch up with the main idea of the talk even to people who do not focus on the particular area. The introduction is complemented by a few witty remarks. Accompanying slides contain well-selected images that underline the main concepts and help the audience to keep up with the talk; only a minimum of text is shown on the slides. The language, pacing, and intonation are appropriate.

-great!

#### 8) VISUALIZATION: A PETRI DISH FOR INTELLIGENCE AUGMENTATION

This talk introduces interactive data visualization and their use in domain-specific toolkit design. It has a great structure, hooks the listeners from the beginning, showcases the strengths of the tools he introduces very clearly and approachably for people outside of computer science – the talk is given in front of life scientists/life scientist audience after all. The talk is really captivating. The supporting visuals used are immersive and on-point.

-great!

Style comment: The second sentence is clear, however, it might be divided into two sentences to make it a bit easier to read.

9) I would prefer stronger use of sign-posting language and structure throughout the presentation. It contained key takeaways/implications/summary at the end, which I enjoyed.

The content of the talk was adjusted to the audience and to previous talks at the conference, which is great! It was informative, understandable and entertaining.

The language was likely appropriate to the audience, as this was at a conference on Language centers in Higher Education. The speed, clarity and intonation of the speaker's voice were on point, although I would prefer at points a slightly faster/more dynamic speech.

The body language of the speaker was appropriate, with nice gesturing to complement the talk, at times the speaker tended to grip the lectern and thus became stiff, but quickly recovered. Sometimes the speaker talks down or just in general has his head down, which might be just a result of the recording angle or due to the presence of the fixed microphone. It seems that the speaker saw his slides on a screen on the table in front of him and not on a screen somewhere in the direction of the audience, which means he looks down quite a lot.

The slides were at points too detailed (text too small, figures likely unreadable to some audience members), I would also not pick a grey background for reasons of contrast (if an old projector is used or the room is too bright). The slides contained a lot of visual and not textual content, which is great!

-great!

Style comment: The text would deserve intro and concluding sentences. In this format, it is a great list of points that might or might not continue.

10) I will start by saying that the presentation is of very high quality that I can only hope to achieve one day. Nevertheless, since I was vehemently looking for something not-entirely-positive to say, I have the following remarks:

The introduction didn't give me a satisfactory answer to "What am I going to get from this lecture."

The speaker stated at the beginning that he wants to present six perspectives on creativity. Later on, he tells the audience that he will show some theories and practical examples and explain how they can be applied in their teaching. The last part of the last sentence seems too vague to me. The implications of the theories at the end were great, but I would appreciate some of that in the introduction/at the beginning.

Since the target audience is academics, teachers, and practitioners of English for Academic Purposes, the topic seems very relevant to the audience. My personal (uneducated) opinion is that the first theory by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi seemed too abstract and less understandable than the rest.

The (body) language seemed almost flawless for my taste, including the speed, intonation, etc.

The slides were a little bit dull. I wouldn't recommend a grey background. I liked how the speaker quickly reacted to the low volume of the video at the end. He immediately simply summarized the video and didn't waste time fixing the technical issue.

Overall I very much enjoyed the talk, thank you very much!

-great!

Style comment: The style is clear, slightly informal.

11) The presentation was very well prepared and started with interesting introduction. Theories of six men followed by the definition of creativity, and the talk concluded with a summary of implications. The speaker spoke clearly, with correct pronunciation, and supported the talk with suitable stories and jokes. The author prepared a lot of relevant and supporting materials, including simple and more hard-to-follow visuals. However, I would consider adding some footers. Besides, it was not easy for me to follow the part about six thinking hats because I immediately forgot the meaning of colours.

In my opinion, the content was appropriate to the audience who seemed to listen and pay attention, which was also related to frequent eye contact with the audience. The use of basic gestures supported the talk, mainly during the middle parts. However, the use of notes was sometimes distracting, especially when the speaker needed to put off two sheets of paper one after another.

The author did not manage to close the presentation appropriately - he showed references after applause. Also, it seems that there were problems with timing since one video about senses was skipped. I would recommend preparing at least one possible alternative scenario in advance so that nobody would notice any problems.

In my opinion, this presentation belongs to very good academic presentations.

-great!

12) In terms of organisation, this talk is well planned. The beginning is a bit fuzzy clarity-wise (we are not sure what is coming next, why, and in what order), but over time the structure becomes clear and logical. Key points are visibly marked and summarized near the end.

Content is entertaining and presents ideas highly relevant for teachers. Between 6:00 and 14:00 (explanation of Csikszentmihalyi's model and some historical perspective), I am losing track of how it relates to creativity, even though it is interesting.

Voice, volume, intonation, and speed are consistent throughout the talk. Language is clear and appropriate for the audience, with the added bonus of not containing unnecessary jargon.

Body language is calm and confident, with reliable eye contact and natural, appropriate hand gestures. Videos dominate among visual aids and they work very well, both as information and as a means of breaking up sensory monotony.

-great!

13) First, I would like to say that I enjoyed the presentation very much and I consider it to be a high-quality piece of work.

The presentation was very well prepared, still did not feel "artificially perfect". I enjoyed speaker trying to incorporate the audience into his speech by asking questions. A pleasant part of the presentation was the audio-visual aid. Even when faced with technical difficulties, the speaker kept a cool head and proved the ability to cope with an unexpected situation.

Considering the use of language, it was adequate with respect to the audience. The pace of the speech matched the topic and was easy to follow. Now and then, I was a little disturbed, when the speaker was searching for a specific thought he wanted to mention and had probably written in his notes.

The quality of slides could be improved by reduction of overflowing text and picture miniatures. Moreover, I think the presentation could have been structured more clearly. The beginning seemed a little chaotic as I was not sure about the topic and what I was about to learn. As the presentation followed, at times I had a feeling that different perspectives of creativity were blending into each other and I could not distinguish the transition from one view to another.

-great!

Style comment: The text might include a clearer concluding sentence.

14) The presentation was obviously well prepared, it had a suitably structured logical sequence. The topic of the talk was clearly stated – creativity. However, in my opinion, the aim of the presentation could have been better introduced. I did not have a great understanding of what to expect in the beginning, but throughout the talk I found out. I really liked the summary and conclusion, which nicely consolidated the talk. The story which began in the introduction and ended in the conclusion was a nice touch.

I appreciate that the topic was adjusted based on the previous talks on the same occasion. It was informative, mostly understandable, definitely interesting and entertaining.

From my point of view both the body language and the English language were impeccable. I could not notice any grammatical or pronunciation inaccuracies. The speed and intonation were adequate. The eye contact was appropriate. I liked the gestures which helped to visualize the presented ideas and made the thoughts easier to follow.

The slides did contain only a little text and consisted mostly of visual elements, which is great. However, the slides seemed a little bit plain – the theme could be improved, the little image in the upper-left corner was distracting. For me, it was a little bit unusual that titles were in lower case. The problems with bad audio were handled well by quick summary of its content, without long attempts to workaroud the problem.

In summary, I enjoyed the talk. Thank you for sharing it.

-great!

Style comment: The text might include an intro sentence.

15) It seemed it was well prepared, maybe even over-prepared (at one point it looked as if you had forgotten to say something you had prepared and said it retroactively, it felt completely unnecessary and slightly disrupting). The beginning was chaotic, there was no clear structure of what to expect, it got somewhat better towards the end. The ending seemed good, attention-grabbing, not too complex, it gave a good "after-taste".

It felt like a popular presentation for general public? At parts, I had trouble understanding, but this might have been due to my computer audio, which isn't that good.

The slides were often empty with nothing on them, and most of what was there seemed somewhat lacking... Some of the images seemed to be there just to have an image, (example: student notes at 29:19), also same example, under the "facts" was "wednesday, 12 tudents...", is it being wednesday in any way relevant? Some of the videos seemed quite out of place, the first video felt completely redundant (the student introducing themselves), especially since what she said was written in the slide before, and in the group experiment (electing leader, then, showing failure) the first video always seemed completely unnecessary, and even the video of the students seemed to lack any real point.

Overall you tried to interact with the audience, but the very first question about creativity at the beginning felt a bit off, it was given as if answer was expected and then you continued as if it was just a rhetoric question.

-great!

Style comment: The text is informal. It is fine in this format, however, in general, in academic texts, it is rare to communicate with the readers directly with "you".

16) The presentation seemed well prepared, but still preserved a nice, natural flow that is often lost when someone over-prepares a presentation. It has a structure that is relatively standard and, therefore, quite logical. However, I feel like I was not sure what the presentation was about at the beginning - definitely not from reading the name of the talk (that could be very well forgiven) but I was left a bit confused even after the introduction. However, all of the confusion is resolved during the main part of the presentation and nicely summarized with key points at the end.

As the topic 'creativity', is very broad, I don't think it's suitable to focus on 'topic coverage' - I feel that you can talk about creativity endlessly, and still have more to say. However, the talk stays very much on-topic. Similarly, as I am not familiar with the audience of 'Language Centers in Higher Education', I can only guess it was appropriate :) The keynote was however very interesting even for me as a completely unrelated person.

I have little to complain about regarding the language used. The accent of the talk-giver is clear, I have not noticed any problem with grammar or pronunciation. Sometimes the listeners had to listen to 'Ummm, Eehh, Aaah' sounds, however, it was not too disturbing, at least for me. My only proper complaint would be the excessive noise in the recording, but I believe this is out of the author's hands. The body language seems fine, too. I can only assume the author is looking at the audience, as he is not looking at the camera.

The supporting slides were a little lacking from a graphic design point of view (I would definitely not use the shrunken image of the cartoon elephant - maybe use an elephant pictogram instead?), but content-wise seemed appropriate and nice.

-great!

Style comment: The text is informal at times, e.g. when “:-)” is used.