2020 Annual Assembly
Abstract Process

AAHPM and HPNA collaborate to review and select abstracts for Annual Assembly. The committees meet prior to the calls to review and update the Assembly objectives (Planning Committee), topic areas, keywords, criteria and process for each call based on the evaluations and opportunities for improvement that are identified from the previous planning and Assembly. (See Assembly Committee Charges in Appendix A.)

Members as subject matter experts are responsible for content; staff are responsible for operations.

	Session Type	Responsible Committee	Membership	Abstract Reviews**
Call 1	workshops, concurrent sessions (including SIG endorsed)	Planning Committee	AAHPM co-chair + 4 members HPNA co-chair + 4 members	over 80 reviewers from AAHPM and HPNA (goal of equal representation) and committee members
	Interactive Educational Exchange	Education SIG Chair	Chair Past Chair Chair Elect	Pilot testing 10 Pediatric reviewers to review only Pediatric content submitted as Concurrent sessions
				10 reviewers total from AAHPM and HPNA, 5 from each organization
Call 2	scientific and quality improvement projects papers and posters	Scientific and Quality Improvement Subcommittee	AAHPM co-chair + 6 members HPNA co-chair + 6 members	c. 50-60 reviewers from AAHPM and HPNA and committee members with expertise in research and quality improvement
Call 3	cases (papers and posters)	Case Subcommittee	AAHPM co-chair + 4 members HPNA co-chair + 4 members	c. 35-40 reviewers from AAHPM and HPNA (goal of equal representation) and committee members
	Scholar ePosters	Scholar ePoster Work Group	AAHPM co-chair + 2 members HPNA co-chair + 2 members	15-25 reviewers from AAHPM and HPNA (goal of equal representation) and committee members

**The number of reviewers is approximate. If more members express interest in reviewing, they can be utilized in the review process.

Call 1 - April/May
- Unblinded (reviewers see names and institutions of abstract authors); this offers the committee the opportunity to consider multiple variables when selecting sessions; it also assures that one author or institution or geographic area is not over-represented in the selection process.
- SIG review and endorsement process occurs before the close of the call (separate process)
- Once the call is closed, each abstract is assigned 4 reviewers, 2 each from AAHPM and HPNA (Membership is a requisite for serving as a reviewer.)
- Reviews are completed based on the criteria that is included in the call for abstracts. The definition for scores (1-5) are detailed in Appendix B.
- Staff works with the meetings management team to determine the total number of rooms available for each type of session and a schedule template is developed.
- Once all reviews are completed, a summary report is developed that includes the abstract authors, title, audience level, reviewer scores, average score, topic areas (primary and secondary) author and reviewer comments. These excel spreadsheets (one each for workshop, SIG endorsed, and concurrent) are presented to the co-chairs sorted by average score and topic category.
- A conference call or email communication with the co-chairs and staff liaison results in creating a cut off score for each type of session that results in the approximate number of accepted abstracts as there are session slots available.
- A call with the full Planning Committee (often 2 calls of 60-90 minutes are needed) is convened to review the results of these cut off scores. The discussion focuses on whether the content is balanced across practice settings, topics, and practice levels. Abstracts that fall near the cut off are reviewed. Is there an outlying score (3 reviewers scored high and one scored low)? Do reviewer comments help to discern value and need for the session? Does it cover a topic area that is underrepresented? Final selections are made based on consensus.
- Regarding SIG endorsed sessions, if an abstract scored well but is not accepted as a SIG endorsed session, it can be reconsidered for acceptance as a regular concurrent. This means that high quality SIG endorsed abstracts get considered twice by the Planning Committee.
- Primary authors and co-authors are notified of acceptance or non-acceptance.
- Sessions are slotted by staff based on topic area (spreading similar content across the Assembly) and slotting is reviewed by the co-chairs for topic balance. Once confirmed, authors are notified of the time and date of their presentation.
- In the first call for abstracts for the 2020 Annual Assembly a pilot test is being conducted with Pediatric reviewers. Pediatric reviewers are selected to review Pediatric specific content for concurrent abstracts received in the first call. These SMEs only complete reviews for Pediatric abstracts and provide recommendations to the Annual Assembly Planning Committee. The Annual Assembly Planning Committee will make the final abstract selections.

Interactive Educational Exchange (IEE)
- Unblinded (reviewers see names and institutions of abstract authors); this offers the IEE co-chairs the opportunity to consider multiple variables when selecting sessions; it also assures that one author or institution or geographic area is not over-represented in the selection process.
- Once the call is closed, each abstract is assigned 2 reviewers, 1 each from AAHPM and HPNA (Membership is a requisite for serving as a reviewer.)

- Reviews are completed based on the criteria that is included in the call for abstracts. The definition for scores (1-5) are detailed in [Appendix C](#).
- Staff works with the meetings management team to assign room.
- Once all reviews are completed, a summary report is developed that includes the abstract title, authors, reviewer scores, average score, lists whether one or more ACGME competency is addressed, author comments, and reviewer comments on strengths and areas of improvement. The excel spreadsheet is presented to the co-chairs sorted by abstract.
- A conference call or email communication with the co-chairs and staff liaison results in creating a cut off score that results in the approximate number of accepted sessions, up to 5 session slots available.
- A call with the IEE co-chairs (60-90 minutes is convened to review the results of cut off scores. The discussion focuses on whether the content is balanced and abstract submission criteria is met. Abstracts that fall near the cut off are reviewed. If there an outlying scores (1 reviewer scored high and one scored low)? Do reviewer comments help to discern value and need for the session? Final selections are made based on consensus.
- Primary authors and co-authors are notified of acceptance or non-acceptance.
- Accepted abstracts are slotted by staff during a 90 minute session. Once confirmed, authors are notified of the time and date of their presentation.
- Mentors are assigned to each accepted abstract by the co-chairs.

Call 2 – July/August
- Blinded call (reviewers do not see authors or institutions of submissions); abstracts are research, science and quality improvement projects so blinding the reviews promotes objectivity.
- Once the call is closed, each abstract is assigned 4 reviewers, 2 each from AAHPM and HPNA. (Membership is a requisite for serving as a reviewer. The Research Committees and SIGs from both organizations have the opportunity to serve on the committee and serve as reviewers via the call for reviewers to AAHPM and HPNA members.)
- Reviews are completed based on the criteria that is included in the call for abstracts. The definition for scores (1-5) are detailed in [Appendix D](#).
- Staff clarifies the number of rooms available for paper sessions and the amount of space available for posters onsite to define the maximum number of abstracts – papers and posters – that can be accepted.
- Once all reviews are completed, a summary report is developed that includes the abstract title, reviewer scores, average score, type of abstract (original, systematic review or quality improvement project), topic areas, keywords and reviewers' comments. These excel spreadsheets (one each for abstracts to be considered for papers only, posters only, or either paper or poster) are presented to the co-chairs sorted primarily by average score. If necessary, they are also sorted by average score and corresponding keyword.
- A conference call with the co-chairs and staff liaison results in creating a cut off score for papers and posters and recommendations for the approximate number of accepted abstracts to fill the available session slots and poster space.
- A call with the full Scientific and Quality Improvement Subcommittee (60 minutes) is convened to review and finalize the results of these cut off scores. The discussion focuses on whether the

content has balanced topics and keywords. Abstracts that fall near the cut off are reviewed. Is there an outlying score (3 reviewers scored high and one scored low)? Do reviewer comments help to discern value and need for the session? The priority is to feature the best and most relevant research and quality improvement projects at Assembly. Final selections are made based on consensus.

- Primary authors are notified of acceptance or non-acceptance.
- Sessions are slotted by staff and co-chairs based on keywords or topic area with the goal to group paper presentations with other research and quality improvement projects that are related. Once confirmed, authors are notified of the time and date of their presentation.

Call 3 - October
- Blinded call (reviewers do not see authors or institutions of submissions) based on the decisions of the co-chairs starting in 2014 (for the 2015 Assembly)
- Once the call is closed, each abstract is assigned 4 reviewers, 2 each from AAHPM and HPNA (Membership in a requisite for serving as a reviewer.)
- Reviews are completed based on the criteria that is included in the call for abstracts. The definition for scores (1-5) are detailed in Appendix E.
- Staff clarifies the number of rooms available for case sessions and the amount of space available for posters onsite to define the maximum number of abstracts – oral and poster – that can be accepted.
    - Presentations are accepted from two categories: Professionals (5+ years in the field) or Early Career (-5 years in the field)/Professionals in Training (students, fellows, etc.)
        - Note: The number of abstracts accepted from the two categories (Professionals vs. Professionals in Training/Early Career) may vary from year to year as accepting the highest quality content is the goal of the Annual Assembly.
- Once all reviews are completed, a summary report is developed that includes the abstract title, reviewer scores, average score, topic areas, author, and reviewer comments. These excel spreadsheets (one each for abstracts to be considered for oral only, posters only, or either oral or poster) are presented to the co-chairs sorted by average score and by average score and domains.
- A conference call or email communication with the co-chairs and staff liaison results in creating a cut off score for oral and posters that results in the approximate number of accepted abstracts as there are session slots and poster space available.
- A call with the full Case Submission Subcommittee is convened to review the results of these cut off scores. The discussion focuses on whether the content has balanced topics, practice levels and interdisciplinary. Abstracts that fall near the cut off are reviewed. Is there an outlying score (3 reviewers scored high and one scored low)? Do reviewer comments help to discern value and need for the session? The priority is to feature the best and most relevant interdisciplinary case studies at Assembly. Final selections are made based on consensus.
- Primary authors are notified of acceptance or non-acceptance.
- Sessions are slotted by staff based on topic area (attempting to group case presentations with other interdisciplinary case studies that is related) and slotting is reviewed by the co-chairs. Once confirmed, authors are notified of the time and date of their presentation.

September 2019

Scholar ePosters

- Blinded call (reviewers do not see authors or institutions of submissions)
- Once the call is closed, each abstract is assigned 4 reviewers, 2 each from AAHPM and HPNA (Membership in a requisite for serving as a reviewer.)
- Reviews are completed based on the criteria that is included in [Appendix E](#).
- Four monitors are available for e-posters onsite and a maximum of 28 abstracts are accepted.
- Once all reviews are completed, a summary report is developed that includes the abstract title, reviewer scores, average score, topic areas, author, and reviewer comments. The excel spreadsheet is presented to the co-chairs sorted by average score and topic category.
- A conference call or email communication with the co-chairs and staff liaison results in creating a cut off score for the e-posters that results in the approximate number of accepted abstracts as there are space available.
- A call with the AAHPM/HPNA Reviewers is convened to review the results of these cut off scores. The discussion focuses on whether the content has balanced topics, practice levels and interdisciplinary. Abstracts that fall near the cut off are reviewed. Is there an outlying score (3 reviewers scored high and one scored low)? Do reviewer comments help to discern value and need for the session? The priority is to feature the best and most relevant topics at Assembly. Final selections are made based on consensus.
- Primary authors are notified of acceptance or non-acceptance.
- Sessions are slotted by staff based on topic area and slotting is reviewed by the co-chairs. Once confirmed, authors are notified of the time and date of their presentation.