

Abstract scoring sheet 2021: Name of presenter _____ . Judged by _____.

Evaluation components	Unsatisfactory (1 point)	Satisfactory (2 points)	Outstanding (3 Points)	Score
Title: Is the title descriptive and does it capture the nature of the research being done?	The title does not reflect the research being done.	The title describes the work being done.... and is written in such a way as to capture the reader's attention.	
Author affiliations: Are the author affiliations included and appropriately formatted.	Poorly formatted or incomplete affiliations	The author affiliations are complete and correctly formatted (2 points)		
Background: Does the background succinctly and clearly introduce the topic of the research, give a measure of the importance of the topic, and identify the gap in understanding that the research will address?	The topic of research and gap in understanding are not obvious.	The main topic of research and the gap in understanding are clear, a measure of importance is included....	...and the research is seated within a broader topical context.	
Hypothesis and aims: Is the hypothesis identified and are the aims apparent?	The hypothesis and aims are not clearly identified or are ambiguous. (1 point)	The hypothesis and aims are clearly identified and defined. (2 points)		
Methods: Do the methods contain enough information to enable the reader to understand what was done, and how?	Methods are not clearly identified.	The methods describe what was done: data sources, methods of data collection and/or experimental approaches are provided...	...and the author convinces the reader that the methods used were appropriate to the research.	
Results: Are the results of the research articulated and is sufficient detail provided to support the conclusions?	Results are not presented clearly and/or lack the required level of detail.	The results section describes what was learnt in sufficient detail to support the stated conclusions, with all units of measurements stated and any required confidence limits given; or The results section provides an explanation of why no results were achieved...	...and relates the findings to the hypothesis.	
Conclusion: Are the primary conclusion and any additional findings of importance well identified and is the significance/impact of the findings highlighted?	The conclusion is unclear.	The conclusions, anticipated or final, are clearly stated, flow from the hypothesis and research findings, any limitations are identified...	...and they describe how this work will contribute to the field. (3/3*)	
Language: Is the abstract well-written, free of typographical and grammatical errors and with all acronyms explained?	The abstract is wordy and nonspecific, and/or understanding is impaired by typographical and grammatical errors.	The abstract is concise, includes specific details...	...and there are no errors in language and all acronyms are defined on first use. (3/3*)	
Communication: Was the abstract engaging and did it leave you wanting to know more?	No: the abstract was difficult to read and not inviting.	Somewhat: The abstract was readable and fulfilled the requirements, but the narrative structure/language was workmanlike.	Yes: The abstract was a delight to read. (3/3*)	

Where an element of the abstract is clearly missing, or is of insufficient merit, the judge can award 0 (zero) points

3* can be selected by an examiner where indicated to denote an abstract of exceptional quality. This will be considered in the final ranking of abstracts.