

TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR AWARDS

BEST PAPER AWARD AND BEST PRESENTER AWARD

A. BEST PAPER AWARD

1. Eligibility

i. All full papers/manuscripts that have been accepted and presented at the conference are eligible for consideration for the **Best Paper Award**.
ii. The paper must comply with the format and guidelines stipulated by the Organiser.
iii. Only full papers submitted within the stipulated period, **on or before 19th September 2026**, will be evaluated.

2. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation for the **Best Paper Award** will take into consideration the following aspects:

i. Originality and novelty of the research.
ii. Significance and relevance of the topic.
iii. Clarity of the research objectives or research questions.
iv. Appropriateness and accuracy of the methodology.
v. Quality of data analysis and interpretation of findings.
vi. Significance of the findings and contribution to the relevant field.
vii. Use of appropriate, relevant, and up-to-date references.

B. BEST PRESENTER AWARD

1. Eligibility

i. All participants who deliver a presentation under the designated categories are eligible for consideration for the **Best Presenter Award**.
ii. The presentation must be delivered by the registered presenter.
iii. The presenter must adhere to the presentation time allocated by the Scientific Committee **(REFER to the Presenter Guidelines)**.

2. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation for the **Best Presenter Award** will take into consideration the following aspects:

i. Mastery of the presented topic.
ii. Clarity and organisation of the presentation.
iii. Ability to clearly explain the objectives, methodology, findings, and conclusions.
iv. Quality and effectiveness of visual materials or presentation slides.
v. Confidence and professionalism during the presentation.
vi. Time management.
vii. Ability to answer questions accurately and convincingly.

C. GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

i. Each award is subject to the decision and endorsement of the **Scientific Committee/Organiser**.

ii. The Scientific Committee reserves the right **not to confer an award** if no candidate meets the minimum standard stipulated.

iii. Any violation of academic ethics, including plagiarism, fabrication, or manipulation of data, may result in the candidate being disqualified from consideration for the award.

iv. The Scientific Committee reserves the right to amend these terms and conditions where necessary.

v. All decisions regarding the selection of award recipients are **final, and no appeals will be entertained**.

Best Paper Award Evaluation Rubric

CRITERION	5 - EXCELLENT	4 - VERY GOOD	3 - GOOD	2 - FAIR	1 - POOR
ORIGINALITY AND NOVELTY	Presents a clearly new idea, approach, method, or application.	Has clear original elements, although some parts are based on existing work.	Mainly based on existing work but includes some new elements.	Mostly repeats existing work with little new contribution.	No clear new idea, approach, or contribution.
SIGNIFICANCE AND RELEVANCE	Addresses an important issue or gap with clear relevance to the field.	Addresses a relevant issue or gap with good importance to the field.	Topic is relevant, but its importance or need is only partly explained.	Relevance to the field is limited or weakly explained.	Relevance or importance of the study is not established.
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES / QUESTIONS	Objectives/questions are clear, specific, and fully addressed by the study.	Objectives/questions are clear and mostly addressed by the study.	Objectives/questions are stated but are broad or only partly addressed.	Objectives/questions are unclear or poorly linked to the study.	Objectives/questions are missing or not addressed.
METHODOLOGY	Methods are appropriate, clearly explained, and fully support the objectives.	Methods are appropriate and clearly explained, with only minor weaknesses.	Methods are generally appropriate but some details or justification are missing.	Methods have important weaknesses or are not clearly explained.	Methods are inappropriate or insufficient to address the objectives.
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	Analysis is appropriate and all main interpretations are clearly supported by the results.	Analysis is appropriate and most interpretations are supported by the results.	Analysis is generally appropriate, but some interpretations need stronger support.	Analysis has clear weaknesses and several interpretations are poorly supported.	Analysis is inappropriate or conclusions are not supported by the results.
FINDINGS AND	Findings clearly	Findings answer the	Findings generally	Findings only partly	Findings do not

CONTRIBUTION	answer the objectives and provide a strong contribution to the field.	objectives and provide a meaningful contribution.	answer the objectives but the contribution is moderate.	answer the objectives and contribution is limited.	adequately answer the objectives or show a clear contribution.
REFERENCES	References are relevant, sufficient, current, and consistently support the study.	References are relevant and mostly current, with only minor gaps.	References are generally relevant but some important or recent sources are missing.	References are limited, outdated, or do not adequately support several parts of the study.	References are inadequate, largely irrelevant, or poorly support the study.

Best Presenter Award Evaluation Rubric

CRITERION	9 – 10 EXCELLENT	7 – 8 GOOD	5 – 6 SATISFACTORY	3 – 4 FAIR	1 -2 POOR
MASTERY OF THE PRESENTED TOPIC	Shows limited understanding of the topic and research. Has difficulty explaining basic concepts related to the study.	Shows some understanding, but knowledge of important concepts or the research is limited.	Shows adequate understanding of the topic and research, but lacks depth in some areas.	Demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of the topic and research.	Demonstrates excellent command of the topic and research, including its wider scientific or societal context.
CLARITY & ORGANISATION OF THE PRESENTATION	Presentation is difficult to follow. Ideas are poorly arranged and transitions are unclear or missing.	Some organisation is present, but several sections are disconnected or difficult to follow.	Presentation has a logical structure, but some sections or transitions could be clearer.	Presentation follows a clear and logical sequence with good transitions between sections.	Presentation is highly coherent and well structured, with smooth transitions throughout.
EXPLANATION OF OBJECTIVES, METHODOLOGY, FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS	Objectives, methods, findings, and conclusions are unclear or inadequately explained. Important information is missing or difficult to understand.	Some key components are explained, but several are unclear, incomplete, or poorly connected.	Key components are generally explained and understandable, but some details or connections are lacking.	Objectives, methodology, findings, and conclusions are clearly explained and logically connected.	Clearly and concisely explains all key components and shows strong connections between the objectives, methodology, findings, and conclusions.
QUALITY & EFFECTIVENESS OF VISUAL	Slides are difficult to read, overcrowded,	Slides have several problems with readability, layout,	Slides are generally readable and organised, but	Slides are clear, readable, and well organised. Figures,	Slides are professional, concise, and

MATERIALS / SLIDES	poorly organised, or contain major errors. Visuals do not effectively support the presentation.	amount of text, or quality of figures/tables.	some visuals, text, or formatting could be improved.	tables, and images effectively support the presentation.	visually effective. Figures, tables, and images clearly enhance understanding of the research.
CONFIDENCE & PROFESSIONALISM	Presentation lacks confidence and professionalism. Speech is difficult to hear or understand, with little eye contact or audience engagement.	Delivery is inconsistent. Speech, eye contact, body language, or audience engagement needs considerable improvement.	Presents with reasonable confidence and professionalism. Speech is generally clear with some eye contact and audience engagement.	Presents confidently and professionally with clear speech, good eye contact, and effective audience engagement.	Presents with excellent confidence and professionalism. Delivery is natural and engaging, with clear speech, strong eye contact, and effective interaction with the audience.
TIME MANAGEMENT	Poor time management significantly affects completion of the presentation. Important sections are omitted or incomplete.	Presentation is noticeably rushed or too slow and does not effectively fit the allocated time.	Presentation is completed close to the allocated time, but some sections are rushed or unevenly paced.	Completes the presentation within the allocated time with appropriate pacing.	Uses the allocated time very effectively, with balanced coverage and appropriate emphasis on all key sections.
ABILITY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ACCURATELY	Unable to answer adequately; shows limited understanding.	Answers some questions, but responses are unclear or incomplete.	Answers most questions adequately, but lacks detail or confidence.	Answers clearly and accurately with good understanding.	Answers accurately and confidently with excellent understanding.