



PESM Student Oral Presentation award

Competition Rules

1. While submitting an abstract to the PESM workshop, the author must select YES under the option “PESM Oral Student Presentation Contest”.
2. The lead author and presenter must be a student registered at a valid university, up to 1 year past the date when the PhD degree was granted.
3. The presented work must be the student’s own work.
4. The lead author must present his work himself, in English within the allocated time.
5. If won, the “Best PESM Student Oral Presentation award” will be handled only to the presenting author.
6. The award will be announced and handled after the final PESM talk on Wednesday afternoon.
7. By registration to the PESM student oral presentation contest, authors confirm that if granted the prize, a) that they are ready to accept the award and b) they will be present to be handled their prize. These two conditions are mandatory. Authors entering the best oral paper competition must therefore stay until last day of the PESM workshop (Wednesday).

Procedure

The oral presentations will be evaluated **for papers presented during the PESM workshop** and there is **only one** Best PESM Student Oral Presentation award.

The evaluation shall be done in **three phases**, involving both the abstract and the oral presentation.

The first phase is based on the assessment of the abstract reviewers and shall be considered as a pre-selection.

The second phase is done during the oral sessions by a team of examiners and shall be based on criteria mentioned in the next section.

In the third phase, the evaluators will get together and decide on the ranking. The winner is identified.

Criteria

Phase 1

A certain number of oral presentations, for each topic shall be selected for phase 2, based on their score during the PESH abstract review process.

Phase 2

The evaluation during the oral session is done based on the presentation as such and on the interaction between the presenter and the audience. Each examiner independently prepares a ranking of the talks under his responsibility. While emphasizing **communication** and **graphical design**, the following 2 points should be considered, e.g. assessed by the listed, indicative questions:

1. **Technical quality**
 - a. Overall quality of the research.
 - b. Was the approach innovative?
 - c. Depth of the research topic.
 - d. How well did the student master the subject?
 - e. How important are the results to the research field?
2. **Presentation quality**
 - a. Clarity of the presentation.
 - b. How well did the student explain the importance of his work?
 - c. How did the student relate his research to that of others?
 - d. Was the presentation appealing and inspiring?
 - e. How well did the student answer questions?

Phase 3

Before the end of the last PESH session, all examiners will meet, for each track. Based on the scores obtained during phase 2, the winners will be identified. The award will be granted and handled at the end of the last PESH session.

Team of Examiners

A president will chair and manage the contest. Three examiners will be selected by the PESH scientific committee. These examiners must have proven an excellent track of records in the field of etching and show enough seniority to be able to evaluate the talks according to the criteria mentioned above. The examiners names will be released publicly, before handing the prizes. The examiners can be part of the PESH scientific committee, PESH invited speakers, but this is not mandatory. If an examiner has a conflict of interest with some talks, he is requested to mention that to his peers before the start of the evaluation. He will be forbidden to review and score the talk for which he has a conflict; he will not influence the discussions if this talk is considered for the award.

President (2022): Dr **Alexey Milenin** (imec v.z.w.)