



## Scientific Research – Scoring Rubric

### Scientific Content (up to 20 points)

#### I. Purpose: Hypothesis, Aim, or Objective (0-2 points)

Assigned Score \_\_\_\_\_ /2

- \_\_\_\_\_ Clearly explained hypothesis, aim, or objective (2)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Reasonable explanation of hypothesis, aim, or objective (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Hypothesis, aim, or objective **NOT** clearly stated or explained (0)

#### II. Methods: Study Design (0-10 points)

Assigned Score \_\_\_\_\_ /10

##### **Explanation**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Design is clearly explained (2)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Reasonable explanation of design (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Design is **NOT** clearly explained (0)

##### **Data Collection**

Data collection methods are appropriate and well-described. Higher scores for more complex methods (e.g., prospective longitudinal > cross sectional > retrospective data collection)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Highly appropriate, complex, and well-explained (4)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Appropriate, moderately complex, and explained (3)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Somewhat appropriate with basic complexity and some explanation (2)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Minimally appropriate with limited explanation (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Data collection methods are **NOT** appropriate or not discussed (0)

##### **Design Appropriateness to study**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Design maximizes study question (2)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Design appropriate to study question (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Unclear design appropriateness (0)

##### **Design Flaws**

- Design flaws recognized, clearly described, and potential impact on results is acknowledged or explained (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Flaws in design are significant and/or not recognized (0)

##### **Study Population/Participant Selection**

Participants represent a population historically underrepresented in research, vulnerable or difficult to access, or research poor setting

- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ No (0)

#### III. Results (0-4 points)

Assigned Score \_\_\_\_\_ /4

##### **Analysis**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Well described data analysis (advanced approach) (2)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Basic analysis, appropriate for stated design (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ No/Limited explanation of the employed statistics (0)

##### **Explanation**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are clearly explained and match methods (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Results are **NOT** explained well with extraneous information or missing (0)

##### **Organization**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are well organized and abstract is clearly written (1)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Results are **NOT** organized well or abstract is poorly written (0)



## Scientific Research – Scoring Rubric

### IV. Conclusion (0-1 points)

Assigned Score \_\_\_\_\_ /1

#### Conclusion

\_\_\_\_\_ Conclusions are supported by results (1)

\_\_\_\_\_ Conclusions are insufficient or **NOT** well supported by results (0)

### V. Overall Impact (0-3 points)

Assigned Score \_\_\_\_\_ /3

Innovative content that can change/challenge how attendees conduct clinical practice, education, research, programming, and merit for oral presentation consideration. Higher points for the potential for results to be used in near future (rather than needing several further steps before rolling out) (0/3)

\_\_\_\_\_ (3) Outstanding      \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Strong      \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Okay      \_\_\_\_\_ (0) Not good

**Total Score for Scientific Content** \_\_\_\_\_ /20

### VI. Additional Questions

***Are there ethical or other concerns or should this abstract be rejected?***

\_\_\_\_\_ No

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes - briefly justify:

**Optional anonymous feedback to authors:** If applicable, please provide any anonymous feedback that may be helpful to the submitter. Please note that your feedback will be shared directly with authors without review or editing.