|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Poster Title** | **Poster “Food Spoilage”** |
| **Date of Review** | **30/04/2018 (final review – english version)** |
| **Reviewer’s Name & Organization** | **Paulo Baptista / P&B** |

1. **Assessment of Poster by the Reviewer**

Mark with X the appropriate column:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Impression/Quality** | **1-Unsatisfactory** | **2-Fair** | **3-Average** | **4-Good** | **5-Excellent** |
|  |  |  | **X** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **POSTER PRESENTATION (APPEARANCE)** | **Y** | **N** | **NA** | **Comments** |
| The FOODQA and Erasmus logos can be easily identified. | **X** |  |  |  |
| The poster attracts viewer attention and is appealing to look at. | **X** |  |  |  |
| The poster is well organized, easy to follow and has a logical, clear progression of ideas.  | **X** |  |  |  |
| The poster stimulates interest and discussion. | **X** |  |  |  |
| Words (font size or style) are easy to read from an appropriate distance (3’-5’).  | **X** |  |  |  |
| Colour schemes used are easy on the eye. | **X** |  |  |  |
| Graphics and other visuals enhance presentation. | **X** |  |  |  |
| Graphs and figures are clear and well labeled. | **X** |  |  |  |
| Illustrations are of good technical quality.  | **X** |  |  |  |
| Illustrations are relevant to the presentation.  | **X** |  |  |  |

| **CONTENT** | **Y** | **N** | **NA** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The title is specific, adequate and short. | **X** |  |  |  |
| Topic and purpose are clearly identified.  | **X** |  |  |  |
| Content is clear and easy to understand. | **X** |  |  |  |
| Content (text) is accurate.  | **X** |  |  |  |
| The content is according to the work package objectives. | **X** |  |  |  |
| The poster is free of unnecessary detail. | **X** |  |  |  |
| The poster supports main points.  | **X** |  |  |  |
| Important information is readily available and easy to grasp.  | **X** |  |  |  |
| There are no grammatical or spelling mistakes. | **X** |  |  |  |
| The poster contains sufficient scientific explanation, where needed. | **X** |  |  |  |
| The poster does not need the addition of information to reach completeness. | **X** |  |  |  |
| There is not any information in the poster that should be removed. | **X** |  |  |  |

**NA: Please mark as “NA” if the question does not concern the specific deliverable**

1. **Suggested improvements** (Changes that should be implemented - Missing information - Further improvements)

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Improvement** |
| **---** |

1. **Any other observations** (e.g. minor corrections that need attention)

|  |
| --- |
| **Observations** |
| **---** |

1. **Conclusion** (Mark with X the appropriate line)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Poster accepted, no changes required | **X** |
| Poster accepted but changes required |  |
| Poster not accepted, it must be reviewed after changes are implemented |  |