Evaluation Criteria	Excellent – 3	Good – 2	Needs Improvement – 1	Unsatisfactory – 0	Score
Originality/ Innovation	Abstract presents work that is clearly innovative	Abstract presents work that, with some development, could be innovative	Abstract presents work that is not innovative	Abstract presents work that is an obvious copy or imitation of other work	
Relevance/ Broad Appeal	Abstract has exciting implications and relevance to current issues; work is of substantial interest across researchers, practitioners, and policymakers	Abstract has relevance to current issues; work is of moderate interest across researchers, practitioners, and policymakers	Abstract has limited relevance to current issues; value limited to narrow group of researchers, practitioners, or policymakers	Abstract is outside scope of conference, is not relevant to current issues, or has no appeal to conference participants	
Clarity	Abstract is well-balanced and logically organized with substantial detail; technical terms and acronyms are clearly defined; all necessary sections are present (Background, Problem Statement, Objective, Methods, Results, Conclusions)	Abstract is generally balanced and organized with adequate detail; technical terms and acronyms are defined; all necessary sections are present	Abstract has problems with overall organization and limited detail, making it occasionally difficult to follow; technical terms and acronyms are unclearly defined; 1-2 necessary sections are missing	Abstract lacks any organization and detail, making it difficult to follow; technical terms and acronyms are undefined; 2+ necessary sections are missing	
Validity	Abstract reflects valid and reliable methods and outcome measures that are clearly defined	There are minor gaps in the discussion of methods and outcome measures, but what is presented is valid and reliable	There are major gaps in the discussion of methods and outcome measures, but what is presented is valid and reliable	Methods and outcome measures are missing, invalid, or unreliable	
					Total (Out of 12):

Important considerations:
- As a water and health conference, topics without explicit connection to health are off-topic
- Purpose of the background is to inform why the topic is **important and new** to water and health and to explain any technical terms used
- Objectives should be explicitly outlined to respond to a problem identified in the background
- Methods should identify size, context, and any analytical methods used
- Projects that are not yet complete should present preliminary results to allow reviewers to determine whether project will be finished by the conference
- Results should incorporate statistical tests whenever possible
- Conclusions should follow directly from results. Don't make claims that results don't support