

# Abstract scoring rubric

## HGSA Scientific Program Committee



Score	Abstract Quality	Scientific Merit	Impact on Field and Practice	Novelty and Innovation	Distribution
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract exceptionally well-written</li> <li>Clear structure; rigorous adherence to disciplinary norms (e.g. aim / hypothesis, context, rationale / methods, results / ideas, conclusion / implication)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim / hypothesis highly compelling and clearly described</li> <li>Rationale / methods exceptionally rigorous and appropriate</li> <li>Results / ideas well-developed and supported by data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represents top advancement in field</li> <li>Expected to significantly influence practice and policy or inspire new research directions</li> <li>Highly relevant to the broader HGSA audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extremely novel, introducing groundbreaking concepts</li> <li>Substantially enhances understanding or practice</li> </ul>	Conference highlight (<5%)
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract well-written</li> <li>Clear structure; adheres to disciplinary norms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim / hypothesis compelling and clearly described</li> <li>Methods rigorous and appropriate</li> <li>Results / ideas well-developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely to advance the field</li> <li>Expected to influence certain special interest groups (SIGs) or broader HGSA audience</li> <li>Encourages reflection and application</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very novel; introduces fresh ideas that are highly relevant and impactful.</li> </ul>	Definitely platform (~10%)
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract coherent</li> <li>Structured, with identifiable aim / hypothesis, context, rationale / methods, results / ideas, conclusion / implication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim / hypothesis interesting and described well</li> <li>Methods mostly rigorous and appropriate</li> <li>Results / ideas reasonably developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May advance the field</li> <li>Of interest to certain SIG/s; expected to prompt discussion and minor practice enhancements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Novel; contributes new ideas or builds significantly on existing knowledge</li> </ul>	Potential platform (~5), more likely poster (~75%)
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract readable but poorly structured</li> <li>Key components (e.g. aim / hypothesis, methods, results) difficult to discern.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim / hypothesis minimally interesting or unclear</li> <li>Methods questionable or inconsistently applied</li> <li>Results / ideas immature or incomplete</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlikely to advance the field</li> <li>Narrow relevance; limited to a niche audience.</li> <li>Minimal influence or practice or thought.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little to no novelty; largely reiterates existing knowledge.</li> </ul>	Weak poster, possibly decline (~5%)
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract difficult to understand</li> <li>Missing key components (e.g. aim / hypothesis, methods, results)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim / hypothesis not compelling or absent</li> <li>Methods flawed or absent</li> <li>Results / ideas unclear, missing or opinion-based</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevance to field</li> <li>Of no interest to HGSA audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No novelty or originality</li> <li>Adds no value.</li> </ul>	Decline (~1%)
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/5</b>	<b>/5</b>	<b>/5</b>	<b>/5</b>	
<b>TOTAL /20</b>					