

LSA Trainees Prize General Advice re Presentation/Projects

(Complied from audience/adjudicator feedback Feb 2010 LSA Prize event)

The following headings and sub-points are domains used for scoring. Bulleted points are (mostly!) verbatim feedback from audience members previously.

INTRODUCTION

(background/clinical importance/aims/objectives)

- No background slides
- Too long introduction.
- Very relevant to current practice and well presented
- What is the incidence of e.g. pre-op hypothermia and post –op hypothermia? How big are these problems?
- Literature overview slide would have been better at the start in Intro. Section rather than later on

METHODS

(Quality of the design, effort required by the individual e.g. in data collection)

- Need to tell us how much of the work he/she did
- Effort required in data collection by the individual was low because it was a survey
- Data quality likely to be very subjective
- Ethically very very shaky – should have sought ethics committee advice at least.
- Very serious concerns over ethics.
- I disagree about the ‘No need for ethical approval’
- Ethical approval? Was consent sought? Was any (informal) advice sought from ethics committee members even?
- Data quality poor

RESULTS

(Quality of the data, validation, data analysis & effort, correct stats)

Presentation of numerical data:

- Use appropriate number of decimal places
e.g. 2.1 days not 2.12 days, Hb 12.1 not 10.92
- Be consistent with number of decimal places within data domains (e.g. avoid LOS Control Group = 2.1 days, Treatment Group = 2.15 days)
- Avoid expressing continuous data as discrete data (e.g. 2 days) unless obvious difference between the results (2 days versus 13 days)
- Indicate which ‘average’ was used (mean, median, mode, are all ‘averages’)
- Indicate which statistical tests were used (‘I used Excel’ doesn’t cut it!)
- If using busy tables then colour fill the ones that you wish to draw attention to (using a side arrow partly does this but it can be difficult to follow the row of data across in the table that is quite busy)
- Avoid moving rapidly thro busy tables, without using the above device

- When comparing data from 2 groups, don't just use mean of each group and the difference between the means - include spread of data (IQR, SD) as well as central location (median, mean)
- Composite end points have their limitations so draw attention to these (i.e. show insight)

Presentation of graphical data

- Quite busy graphs
- Results too condensed
- If using an exploded pi-diagram, avoid white segment on white background
- Use the pointer to draw attention to key point(s)
- *Busy not easy intelligible graphs*
- *Percentages on Y axis may be better than absolute numbers.*
- *Too many groups for a pie chart (try horizontal bar chart)*
- *Colour scheme for slides could be better*
- *Choice of statistic analyses not correct*
- *Good explanation of stats*
- *I didn't understand 'propensity scoring' (despite long explanation; did I really need to understand it?)*
- *If you used a statistical method that a substantial part of your audience is likely to be unfamiliar with then explain briefly (1 minute rather than 3-4 minutes of a 10 minute presentation); e.g. propensity scoring*
- *Use of integers for LOS data not explained, otherwise excellent.*
- *Good slides tables a bit too busy, good delivery.*
- *Not sure of the matching/confounding factors.*
- *Don't bother mentioning non significant trends*
- *No data regarding range presented (e.g. IQR, SD)*
- *Was mean the correct average to use? Some box and whisker plots would have been nice*
- *Pie charts not clear (light blue vs grey!) - very difficult to interpret/separate out groups*
- *Displaying some of the results in a table would have been better.*
- *The vertical bar charts didn't quite work – using horizontal bar chart would have made it easier to read the text.*
- *What statistical tests were used? Which averages?*

INTERPRETATION

(Conclusions, Recommendations, action plan)

- Interesting subject but didn't seem to come to any conclusions in the presentation
- Slides (as presenter actually alluded to) were 'cluttered and unclear' with no conclusions or recommendations
- No definite conclusion to study
- Good presentation and plenty of material and information, but need to tell us: how much LA used in each technique, need to highlight difference between statistical significance vs clinical importance; and absence of statistical significance and trends [? small numbers in the matched groups]; these results could provide basis for number needed to treat to aid statistical significance in future prospective study

- More diagrams and focusing on the main messages in results would have been better
- Good and essential subject in my opinion and good material, I think one of the main messages he did not bring forward was to stress the fact that "Rehearsal" of the Guideline is essential to future adherence to it
- Less introduction, more results and conclusion
- Avoid '1 patient ruined my data' comments
- If the study data showed a reduced LOS in the study group then it is not reasonable to say that 'this was due to earlier mobilisation' (unless the mobilisation variable was also assessed and correlated accordingly with the LOS data). 'It may have been due to earlier mobilisation, but we have no data on this' would be more accurate

SKILLS

(quality of the presentation oral/visual, handling of Q/A from audience)

- Pre-event advice from an adjudicator: *Speak up, steady pace not too slow or too fast, acquaint yourself to all tools you are going to use on the night, use pointers, look at audience and your slides, if using busy slides apologise about but only point out the salient information in the slide, if co-authored paper try to point to the audience how much work you have done yourself*
- Good presentation but was hurried, ...need to point to slides for areas of interest,
- Good at Q/A
- Too quiet
- Good manner of speech, not rushed.
- Good subject, plenty of material but very slow, low voice, slides are too busy
- Stand up straight!
- Good punchy presentation.
- Nice LWH logo slides!
- Great presentation, clear not rushed. Covered aims, methods results and conclusions.
- Too many slides; too many busy slides; pushed to stay within time limit
- Confident presentation
- Handled quite well, good time keeping but seemed a bit rushed. Slides a bit too busy in places and needs to look at audience more than the screen.
- Liked the extra slides at the end to cover (potential) questions.
- Heading of slides is difficult to read - improved by better choice of colour scheme [not faint blue text against white background!]
- Poor time keeping
 - **STICK TO TIME!**
 - The content of the slide on view should reflect/coincide with the content of what the speaker is saying
 - Allocate sufficient time to any individual slide – if going to run over then exclude some slides for oral presentation and keep them in reserve for Q&A use
 - Use the pointer!
 - Project your voice
 - Avoid spelling mistakes!
 - Avoid looking back at the screen too much, but rather address the audience
- Avoid talking over the person asking the question. Allow him/her to finish the Q.