1. **Review Form for abstracts**

Relevance

- Does the abstract correspond or falls within the goals addressed at the conference?
- Is the proposed topic acceptable?
- If no, please list the conference topic(s) to which the abstract is the closest
- Does the manuscript report significant information, scientific, methodological or technical progress or information in the field of concern?

Marks (points) for evaluation: 1, 2, 3 **(1 = bad, unacceptable, 2 = average, acceptable, poster presentation 3 = good and above normal, to be accepted for oral presentation)**

◯ bad, unacceptable ◯ average, acceptable, poster presentation ◯ good and above normal, to be accepted for oral presentation

Comments, suggestions for improvement

2. **Content**

- Is the title adequate?
- Are the summary and materials used/cited suitable?
- Does the background clearly state the objective(s) of the study?
- Do the selected methods correspond with the nature of study and study questions?
- Is adequate reference made to other works in the field?
- Do the study results logically follow the described methods?
- Does the conclusion integrate the key results?

Marks (points) for evaluation: 1, 2, 3 **(1 = bad, unacceptable, 2 = average, acceptable, poster presentation 3 = good and above normal, to be accepted for oral presentation)**

◯ bad, unacceptable ◯ average, acceptable, poster presentation ◯ good and above normal, to be accepted for oral presentation

Comments, suggestions for improvement

3. **Formal assessment**

- Is the writing clear and brief?
- Is there a logical sequence and cohesiveness among all abstract sections?
- Are proper terms used to describe the methods and discuss findings?

Marks (points) for evaluation: 1, 2, 3 **(1 = bad, unacceptable, 2 = average, acceptable, poster presentation 3 = good and above normal, to be accepted for oral presentation)**

◯ bad, unacceptable ◯ average, acceptable, poster presentation ◯ good and above normal, to be accepted for oral presentation

Comments, suggestions for improvement

4. Global marking

Overall mark for the paper **(1 = bad, unacceptable, 2 = average, acceptable, 3 = good and above, to be accepted)**

◯ bad, unacceptable ◯ average, acceptable, poster presentation ◯ good and above normal, to be accepted for oral presentation

Comments, suggestions for improvement