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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well-written manuscript which provides a good review of Academic poster presentations. My main critiques lie in the actual survey administered and the very low number of responses. I do not believe that any concrete statements can be made based on 34 responses to what seems to be a small local meeting.

Major Revisions

• This paper should include information about the demographics of the survey respondents. For example all respondents may have been students, or alternatively all may have been industry representatives.

• Why was this particular meeting chosen? Is this a relatively important academic meeting? Please provide more information about the meeting to better put the results in context.

• Were those in attendance from many countries; was this meeting a regional meeting or international?

• The introduction is too long and should not get into lengthy discussion. This can be addressed in the discussion section. The introduction should give some context to the research question.

• The Methods section is very short, there is not enough information about the meeting, the audience, the goals of the meeting, the number of attendees.

• Only 34 surveys were returned. Why were only 87 passed out over two meetings. Is this because there were only a few attendees? How were the surveys passed out, in what situation and to whom. How were potential participants identified. Was this done randomly? Was every participant approached?

I feel as though this would serve as the basis of a good review article about posters as a medium for information exchange, but the actual methodology of this research paper needs work. The authors have convinced me that the question of posters as a means of information exchange is important, but they have not convinced me that their research addresses this question.
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