

19th World Congress on Dental Traumatology  
Brisbane, Australia  
11-13 August 2016

**Grading Criteria for Posters**

Each poster will be judged in five areas using a numerical system. Although simple to use, the scoring system will provide discrimination to identify those posters meriting an award. Because many of the presenters will be orally presenting in other than their first language, the judges should be cautious not to lower a score based solely on difficulties in using the language. Each area of the poster clinic will be scored using the following 1 to 10 categorical rating scale:

- 1 = *unsatisfactory*: Fails to provide any useful information *or* the topic did not merit study or discussion
- 2 - 4 = *satisfactory*: Meets a minimum standard, but needs significant improvement in most areas.
- 5 - 7 = *good*: May need some improvement in study design or presentation format or method, but conveys important information in a mostly clear manner
- 8 - 9 = *excellent*: The study or presentation is well designed and organized, statistical tests and analysis are appropriate (if needed), the conclusions are supported by the findings or documentation and the information presented adds significantly to the knowledge base in dental traumatology.
- 10 = *outstanding*: The study or presentation meets all the criteria for the excellent rating *plus* provides the highest level evidence possible for the topic. The study or presentation could be published in a refereed journal.  
**The poster merits top consideration for an award.**

**Areas for Evaluation**

1. **Scientific/clinical merit and value**
  - a. Is the study/clinical/survey report well designed or organized?
  - b. Is the topic important to the field of dental traumatology?
  - c. Is appropriate statistical analysis used, if needed?
  - d. Are the conclusions of the study or report supported by the findings/observations/documentation?
  - e. Does the study or presentation add to the literature base in dental traumatology or the knowledge base of the audience?
2. **Originality of the study or clinical presentation**
  - a. Was a problem identified that needed studying or presenting?
  - b. Did the presenter use a method of study or discussion that is novel or unusual?
3. **Quality of oral presentation**
  - a. Did the presenter provide the listener with the most important information in a clear and succinct manner?
  - b. Was the presenter authoritative, confident and knowledgeable?
4. **Poster format and appearance**
  - a. Is the poster organized in a logical and acceptable order?
  - b. Does the poster convey the presenter's material in a clear and easily understood manner?
  - c. Is the poster attractively designed and does it enhance the understanding of the topic?
5. **Quality of oral responses to questions from the judges**
  - a. Did the presenter know the topic well enough to intelligently discuss it with the judge?
  - b. Did the presenter use the literature to support or defend the study or discussion?
  - c. Was the presenter confident, enthusiastic and knowledgeable in his/her responses?