General evaluation criteria for posters

Component	Excellent 5	Very Good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 0	Score
Scope/ Introduction/Abstract (SIA)	A SIA that shows motivation, placement in literature and impact in a logical, coherent way	A SIA that shows motivation, placement in literature and impact but displays a lack of logical coherence	An SIA contained all the parts, but was not clear e.g., use of jargon, more than 250 words etc.	Poorly developed SIA	Poorly developed SIA with missing parts	x/5
Component	**Excellent 10 / 5**	**Very Good 8 / 4**	**Good 6 / 3**	**Fair 4 / 2**	**Poor 0**	**Total Score**
Research question/ Observed phenomenon/ Hypothesis (ROH)	A clearly defined ROH was depicted	A clearly defined ROH was presented but leaves room for alternative statements	The ROH is unsupported by literature, preliminary observations etc.	Goals of ROH were not clear.	The ROH was wrong or missing - goals not stated.	x/10 – x/5
Component	**Excellent 10/5**	**Very Good 8/4**	**Good 6/3**	**Fair 4/2**	**Poor 0**	**Total Score**
Methods and Results	1. Data were correctly analyzed 2. Sufficiently linked to the ROH 3. Method of data generation was detailed enough to replicate the data	1. Data were correctly analyzed 2. Sufficiently linked to the ROH 3. Method of data generation was not detailed enough to replicate the data	1. Data analysis misses correct representation such as statistical methods 2. No description of data generation	Minimal data analysis and amounts of data to link to the ROH.	Hardly any data was shown.	x/10 – x/5

Component	Excellent 10	Very Good 8	Good 6	Fair 4	Poor 0	Total Score
Conclusions & future directions	1. Conclusions took all results into account 2. Future research directions were discussed	1. All results were represented in the conclusions 2. Future directions were underdeveloped and missed support	1. All results were represented in the conclusions 2. Future directions were mostly or completely missed	1. Conclusions were given 2. Little connection to results or ROH	Conclusions were missing	x/10
Component	**Excellent 20**	**Very Good 15**	**Good 12**	**Fair 10**	**Poor 0**	**Total Score**
Poster Presentation	1. Presentation explains the broader embedding into the presented scientific area, 2. Speaks logically and engages the audience, 3. Oral presentation incorporates poster content.	1. Presentation is limited to the scientific scope of the presented study, 2. Speaks logically, 3. Oral presentation incorporates poster content.	1. The scientific scope of the study is poorly presented 2. Oral presentation incorporates some poster content.	1. Poor knowledge of project 2. Difficulty answering questions 3. Poster does not support the presentation 4. Many errors	Not present at their poster	x/20

Additional criteria for the computational award in plant science and its extended phenotypes
(Using x/5 rating for ROH and results)

Component	Excellent 10	Very Good 8	Good 6	Fair 4	Poor 0	Total Score
Code availability	1. The code is available in a software repository such as GitHub 2. The code is well documented 3. The developer supports a user community 4. The code is scalable as a container 5. The code is available as software with a user interface or as part of a web portal	1. The code is available in a software repository such as GitHub 2. The code is well documented 3. The developer supports a user community 4. The code is scalable as a container	1. The code is available in a software repository such as GitHub 2. The code is well documented 3. The developer supports a user community	The code is available in a software repository such as GitHub	The code is only available to the developer on a specialized machine	x/10
Component	**Excellent 10**	**Very Good 8**	**Good 6**	**Fair 4**	**Poor 0**	**Total Score**
Mathematical quality	1. The algorithms were developed from scratch 2. Analysis of algorithm complexity and underlying mathematics 3. The computation was validated.	1. The code implements known mathematics 2. Was evaluated for its run time on specific systems 3. The computation was validated.	1. The code implements known algorithms, 2. the computation was validated.	1. The code brings together existing libraries. 2. The computation was validated.	Unvalidated computation	x/10