Abstract scoring rubric
HGSA Scientific Program Committee

Score	Abstract Quality	Scientific Merit	Impact on Field and Practice	Novelty and Innovation	Distribution
6	• Abstract exceptionally well-written • Clear structure; rigorous adherence to disciplinary norms (e.g. aim / hypothesis, context, rationale / methods, results / ideas, conclusion / implication)	• Aim / hypothesis highly compelling and clearly described • Methods and rational exceptionally rigorous and appropriate • Results / ideas well-developed and supported by data	• Represents top advancement in field. • Expected to significantly influence practice and policy or inspire new research directions. • Highly relevant to broader HGSA audience.	• Extremely novel, introducing groundbreaking concepts. • Substantially enhances understanding or practice.	Conference highlight (<5%)
5	• Abstract well-written • Clear structure; adheres to disciplinary norms	• Aim / hypothesis compelling and clearly described • Methods rigorous and appropriate • Results/ideas well-developed	• Likely to advance the field. • Expected to influence certain special interest groups (SIGs) or broader HGSA audience. • Encourages reflection and application.	• Very novel; introduces fresh ideas that are highly relevant and impactful.	Definitely platform (~10%)
4	• Abstract coherent • Structured, with identifiable aim / hypothesis, context, rationale / methods, results / ideas and / or conclusion / implication	• Aim / hypothesis interesting and described well • Methods mostly rigorous and appropriate • Results / ideas reasonably developed	• May advance the field. • Of interest to certain SIGs; expected to prompt discussion and minor practice enhancements.	• Novel; contributes new ideas or builds significantly on existing knowledge.	Potential platform, possibly poster (~5%
3	• Abstract readable but somewhat inconsistent in structure	• Aim/hypothesis somewhat interesting. • Methods somewhat rigorous but clear gaps exist. • Results/ideas partially developed.	• May or may not advance the field. • Relevant to a narrow audience. • Limited potential to influence practice.	• Somewhat novel; introduces minor new perspectives.	Poster (~75%)
2	• Abstract readable but poorly structured • Key components (e.g. aim / hypothesis, methods, results) difficult to discern	• Aim/hypothesis minimally interesting or unclear. • Methods questionable or inconsistently applied. • Results/ideas immature or incomplete.	• Unlikely to advance the field. • Narrow relevance; limited to a niche audience. • Minimal influence on practice or thought.	• Little to no novelty; largely reiterates existing knowledge.	Weak poster, possibly decline (~5%)
1	• Abstract poorly written and difficult to understand • Missing key components (e.g. aim / hypothesis, methods, results)	• Aim/hypothesis not compelling or absent. • Methods flawed or absent. • Results/ideas unclear, missing, or opinion-based.	• No relevance to field. • Of no interest to HGSA audience.	• No novelty or originality. • Adds no value.	Decline (~1%)
0	• Abstract unreadable or not in English	• Scientific misconduct (e.g. plagiarism)	• Not relevant to HGSA constituency or scientific domain	• Not applicable	Automatic decline (<1%)
Subtotal	/6	/6	/6	/6	
TOTAL /24					