

<b>Poster Title</b>	<b>Food Preservation</b>
<b>Date of Review</b>	<b>30/04/2018 (final review – English version)</b>
<b>Reviewer's Name &amp; Organization</b>	<b>Paola Pittla / UNITE</b>

### 1. Assessment of Poster by the Reviewer

Mark with X the appropriate column:

<b>Overall Impression/Quality</b>	<b>1- Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2-Fair</b>	<b>3-Average</b>	<b>4-Good</b>	<b>5-Excellent</b>
	X				

<b>POSTER PRESENTATION (APPEARANCE)</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>Comments</b>
The FOODQA and Erasmus logos can be easily identified.	X			The Erasmus logo is stretched and deformed in respect to the original. The visibility is however limited by the too strong green colour of the background.
The poster attracts viewer attention and is appealing to look at.	X			Bright colours, a lot of pictures...
The poster is well organized, easy to follow and has a logical, clear progression of ideas.		X		Unclear meaning of the position of the boxes, without any specific clear connection
The poster stimulates interest and discussion.				Maybe yes, not sure
Words (font size or style) are easy to read from an appropriate distance (3'-5').	X			
Colour schemes used are easy on the eye.	X			On my opinion the green colour is to bright or dark and pictures loose their visibility
Graphics and other visuals enhance presentation.	X			
Graphs and figures are clear and well labeled.		X		"Artificial drying" does not exist! Drying is drying...it comes from a natural or forced moisture removal as vapour from a matrix according to spontaneous processes depending on environmental conditions...
Illustrations are of good technical quality.	X			

Illustrations are relevant to the presentation.		X		
---	--	---	--	--

CONTENT	Y	N	NA	Comments
The title is specific, adequate and short.			X	There is no Title
Topic and purpose are clearly identified.		X		It is a mix of contents
Content is clear and easy to understand.		X		Likely some problems with the English translation and many typing errors
Content (text) is accurate.		X		No, see above
The content is according to the work package objectives.	X			
The poster is free of unnecessary detail.		X		There are some parts that are not clear E.g. "physical separation": for and of what ? Why "juice extraction" this is not a technology, but an application, a case study
The poster supports main points.		X		Missing many
Important information is readily available and easy to grasp.		X		
There are no grammatical or spelling mistakes.		X		plenty
The poster contains sufficient scientific explanation, where needed.		X		
The poster does not need the addition of information to reach completeness.		X		Needs a significant revision
There is not any information in the poster that should be removed.				The poster is made of few text, but unclear is its sequence

**NA: Please mark as "NA" if the question does not concern the specific deliverable**

**1. Suggested improvements** (Changes that should be implemented - Missing information - Further improvements)

Suggested Improvement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revision of the English text and typing errors (e.g. prepare", "microbiological", "preserving"?)</li> <li>- Remove "Artificial" from "drying"</li> <li>- Change "method" with "technology"</li> <li>- Make some revision in the "storage" box: air and liquid (unclear meaning) is mixed with packaging materials or packaging modified atmospheres...unclear mix</li> </ul>

**2. Any other observations** (e.g. minor corrections that need attention)

<b>Observations</b>

**3. Conclusion** (Mark with X the appropriate line)

Poster accepted, no changes required	
Poster accepted but changes required	
Poster not accepted, it must be reviewed after changes are implemented	