

Scientific Research Podium and Poster Abstract Review Process and Rubric

2027 Call for Podium and Poster Abstracts and Preconference Workshop Proposals

The Peer Review Process

Double-Blind Review

Conference abstract submissions are managed under a double-blind, peer-reviewed process, meaning that both reviewer and author identities and institutions remain blinded throughout the review and selection process.

Scoring

Abstracts are evaluated using a standardized scoring rubric across seven criteria. Each criterion is cored up to five points on a Likert Scale with a maximum total score of 35 points.

For any criteria scoring a 1, 2, or 5, reviewers are required to provide a brief rationale in the comments section. Each abstract is independently reviewed by a minimum of three peer reviewers. The final abstract score is calculated as the average of the reviewer scores.

Scientific Research Abstract Scoring Rubric

1. Background

The background of the study/work is well described and justifies the rationale/significance of the work

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Background does not provide information that informed the study/work
2. Background is limited or is poorly articulated
3. Background is somewhat well articulated
4. Background is well articulated
5. Background is exemplary in clearly outlining the imperative for the study to be presented at a national/international level

2. Objectives

The objectives of the study/work are clearly and succinctly stated

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Objective is not articulated
2. Objective is poorly articulated

3. Objective is somewhat articulated
4. Objective is clearly articulated
5. Objective is exemplary in its clarity and clear relationship to the background and the study

3. Study Design and Methodology

Study design/methodology is rigorous and appropriate to answer the study/work question

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible)

1. Study design and methods are not articulated
2. Study design and methods are not congruent with the question posed and/or are ambiguous
3. Study design and methods align somewhat with the objective, though some elements require clarification or stronger justification
4. Study design and methods are generally well described
5. Study design and methods are exceptionally well described with clarity and a clear relationship to the study objectives

4. Results

The results are sound, appropriate, responsive to the stated objectives, and sufficiently described with relevant data presented to support the conclusions.

*Reviewer Note: Science and research submissions require results for acceptance.

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible)

1. Results are poorly described, lacking relevant data to support study conclusions
2. Poor analysis. Results provide insufficient description of relevant data to support the conclusions
3. Results are somewhat described but lack some clarity or justification to fully support conclusions
4. Results are sound, appropriate, and have sufficient relevant data presented to support the conclusions
5. Results are exceptionally clear with well-described data that strongly support the conclusions

5. Organization

The abstract is clear, well-organized, adheres to the submission guidelines, ordered, and concise without ambiguities

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible)

1. Abstract is highly disorganized, missing critical information, difficult to understand, improperly formatted
2. Abstract clarity and organization could be improved
3. Abstract is somewhat clear and organized but still contains ambiguities
4. Abstract is clear and adheres to guidelines
5. Abstract is exceptionally clear; provides an clear and appropriately detailed description of the study

6. Importance / Influence in the Field of Hospice and Palliative Care

The study/work is relevant or valuable for professionals in the field of hospice and/or palliative care

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible)

1. The study does not appear relevant or valuable for HPC professionals
2. The study is only minimally relevant or valuable for HPC professionals
3. The study is somewhat relevant or valuable for HPC professionals
4. The study is relevant or valuable for HPC professionals
5. The study is highly relevant or valuable for HPC professionals and is likely to change policy, research or practice

7. Overall Merit Score

The abstract is high quality, important to the field, and should be presented because it is likely to significantly influence future palliative and/or hospice research and practice.

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Weak across multiple axes. Recommend against including presentation.
2. Though abstract has some strengths, overall quality (considering clarity, evidence, relevance, contribution, and importance/influence) is insufficient.
3. Adequate abstract. Acceptable for inclusion if space allows, though does not stand out.
4. Strong abstract. Well-aligned with conference goals and likely to be of interest to the majority of learners. Recommend including as podium presentation.
5. Excellent: Exceptional abstract. Innovative with ideal clarity, evidence base, and relevance. Highly likely to result in meaningful contributions for improvement in learner's competence, performance, and/or professional development. Strongly

recommend prioritizing for inclusion.

Program Alignment Criteria Rubric

In addition to the scored review rubric, reviewers assess a set of Program Alignment Criteria that help shape the overall structure, balance, and educational flow of the Annual Assembly. While these criteria do not factor into an abstract's acceptance score, they play an important role in informing session placement, audience alignment, and integration with overarching conference priorities.

1. Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

The abstract includes diverse representation with a focus on historically minoritized and marginalized populations and/or is anchored in principles of justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (JEDI).

Scoring Options: Yes or No

2. Interdisciplinary Collaboration

The abstract integrates interprofessional/multidisciplinary collaboration with a meaningful impact on hospice and palliative practice, team-based care, and/or professional development.

Scoring Options: Yes or No