

ISWAVLD 2025 June 12-14, 2025 – Calgary, Alberta

Abstract and Case Report Review Criteria

Is there a conflict of interest. Y / N

Note: Please notify the Scientific Organizing Committee Chair ASAP to arrange for another reviewer.

Does the abstract meet fundamental scientific standards for presentation at the meeting? Y / N

Note: If no, do not complete the rest of the questions. The abstract will be rejected.

Please rate the abstract based on the below weighted criteria on a scale of 0 to 2.

- Introduction – 20%
- Methods – 20%
- Results – 20%
- Discussion – 20%
- Writing Quality – 20%

Note: For case reports, only Introduction, Discussion, and Writing Quality will be assessed to a maximum score of 60%.

Please rate the importance and relevance of the subject matter on a scale of 0 to 2.

Does this abstract fit in the current topic session? Y / N

If no, what topic should it be moved to:

Recommendation: Poster Presentation Either Rejection

Any comments for the corresponding author?

ISWAVLD 2025 June 12-14, 2025 – Calgary, Alberta

Scoring Rubric for Abstracts and Case Reports

Scoring Guide: Meets Criteria = (2); Partially Meets Criteria = (1); Inadequate = (0)

	Meets or Exceeds Criteria (2)	Partially Meets Criteria (1)	Inadequate (0)	Score
Introduction*+ 20%	Thorough evaluation of the existing literature that informs the aims of the project; clearly states the relevance of the project/case report and the purpose, aims or hypothesis	Some evaluation of the existing literature, but does not seem to inform purpose/aims of the project or poorly organized; parts of purpose, aims or hypothesis may be missing	Minimal to no evaluation of the existing literature done; purpose, aims or hypothesis are missing	
Methods* 20%	Design and methods are clear and appropriate for the study	Minor issues with design or methods, or are unclear on some aspects, but the methods are overall appropriate	Little to no explanation of design/methods or inappropriate for type of study	
Results* 20%	Results are well organized and thoroughly explained; highlights key findings aligned with purpose, aims or hypothesis	Results are described with some attempt to match results with research purpose, aims or hypothesis	Results are loosely organized but incomplete; no alignment with purpose, aims or hypothesis	
Discussion*+ 20%	Clear synthesis of project/case report findings relating these to the current literature; discussion of limitations; logical conclusion	Generally applicable, accurately summarizes but does not adequately synthesize results with current literature or discuss limitations	Unclear synthesis of findings with current literature; only a rehashing of results; no discussion of limitations	
Writing Quality*+ 20%	Concise and well written, no errors	Minor grammar and/or spelling errors, writing is overly wordy	Major grammar and spelling errors, writing lacks significant editing	
Additional Scoring				
Importance & Relevance*+	Topic is current, relevant, groundbreaking, or significant to the field and audience	The topic may not be current, but it is relevant to the field and audience	Topic is not relevant, not current, and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field.	

*Criteria with a * will be scored only for abstracts. Criteria with a + will be scored only for case reports.*