You must email me your presentation at least a week in advance, so that others get a chance to look at the paper and the presentation and prepare their questions. The first slide must have the complete reference to the paper – journal name, year, issue.

As I listen to your class presentations, I shall be writing down my impression on the following issues.

1. **Choice of research paper**

   (i) How interesting is the research question addressed in the paper and how important is the contribution? Is it likely to appeal to a wide audience? Does the paper raise more interesting questions?

   The quality of the paper is not your “fault” really but your choice sends a signal about you as a would-be researcher! **You may advance your case considerably by going beyond what the authors did to position or sell their work.** Authors very frequently under sell their work. (The “Market for Lemons” paper by Ackerlof was rejected by several top journals before it spawned an entire area in economics.)

   (ii) What is the level of technical difficulty that you had to successfully overcome or new technical expertise that you had to acquire to understand and present the paper?

By this, I am NOT suggesting that you choose papers with complex mathematics. Simple models with great ideas (such as Ackerlof’s) will score high on (i) above. (ii) basically compensates those of you who are choosing to present say a JET paper (a journal which perhaps fewer people read compared to AER) with an important methodological contribution likely to be used by applied economists, some ten years later.

2. **The quality of your presentation**

   (i) How well have you understood the main results of the paper? How clear is your presentation?
Hide the math - more people have ADHD than you imagine! Give intuition, give simple illustrative examples (go beyond what the authors provide, if necessary, and enhance your case), explain in words if possible the main steps of a proof, if you think it is important. All these are signs of good understanding.

(ii) How well are you able to answer questions from people who have not read the paper and may even be asking “silly” questions according to you?

3. Your contribution as a would-be researcher

Have you gone beyond the course requirement of just presenting a paper? For example, have you followed up on the question by doing additional literature survey? Can you think of additional research questions that you may want to pursue?

4. How good are you as a co-worker?

Have you taken the time to read or partly read at least one other paper in the list being presented and asked some questions?

5. Negative marks for:

(i) taking up more than 40 mins for presentation

(ii) not being able to present the main results because you have run out of time

(iii) interrupting with long questions (short clarifications allowed) during others’ presentations

(iv) not emailing me your presentation a week in advance or missing out on reference details