

# Review of: "Visual Science Communication: The next generation scientific poster"

Andrzej Klimczuk<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Warsaw School of Economics

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of the paper is clearly stated.

The problem is well-defined.

The case is made that the problem is significant.

The research questions or hypotheses are not clearly presented

The title, abstract and introduction are appropriate for the paper.

## 2. Literature Review

The literature is recent and relevant. However, more publications from the last three years could be used.

The literature review acknowledges the depth and breadth of investigation in the field.

## 3. Methods

It is not clear are the methods used sufficiently to answer the research questions or hypotheses.

Methods of analysis are not described with enough detail to be reproducible by other investigators.

## 4. Findings

The results are clearly related to the data (including text and numeric).

Figures and tables are understandable, and their primary findings are discussed in the text. However, using black background limits the readability of graphic displays. Also, Figure 2 could be divided into separate figures.

Clarity of the arguments is presented with good logical consistency and flow of argument.

## 5. Discussion and Implications

The findings are only partially discussed in relation to the literature review and research questions or hypotheses.

Implications for theory, policy, and practice are mixed with conclusions. In fact, the “Conclusion” section is used twice in the paper. Section “3. Discussion, perspective and conclusion” should be divided into separate sub-sections.

The strengths and limitations of the study are not adequately described.