

Abstract Evaluation

Stem Cells, Cell Therapy and Bioengineering in Lung Biology and Disease, 2023

For each application, evaluate each of the parameters in the following rubric using the point system in the table.

| Parameter | Rating | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------|------|------|------------------|------------|
| | Outstanding | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Inadequate |
| Background/Introduction | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| A clearly stated hypothesis or aim | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| The technical approach to the study | 20 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 0 |
| The pertinent results obtained with quantitative and statistical comparisons, when appropriate | 30 | 24 | 18 | 12 | 6 | 0 |
| A clearly stated conclusion | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| The significance of the results to the field | 20 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 possible) | | | | | <u>Comments:</u> | |

NOTE: The points indicated under each rating are the maximum score in that section. You may assign any value within the range.

| Criteria | Outstanding | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Inadequate |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Background | Strong, clear and thorough. Literature well-reviewed. | Clear and somewhat thorough. Literature adequately reviewed. | Reasonably clear with relevant details, but not thorough. Some relevant literature has been reviewed. | Unclear and brief. Weak reference to background literature. | Unclear and very short. Does not demonstrate literature has been reviewed. | Not provided. |
| Hypothesis/Aim | A specific, clear and testable research objective is stated. | A clear and testable research objective is stated. | A testable research objective is stated. | A clear, but untestable research objective. | A vague, untestable research objective. | Not provided. |
| Technical Approach | A strong and clear explanation of the proposed experimental methods is provided and these are suitable to comprehensively answer the research question. | A strong and clear explanation of the proposed experimental methods is provided but further approaches may be required to fully address study aim(s). | A clear explanation of the experimental methods is provided. | An adequate explanation of the experimental methods is provided. | An unclear and/or disorganized explanation of experimental methods is provided. | Not provided. |
| Results | The results are clear and connected to the purpose of the study. The results provide findings without interpretation of the results. | The results are clear and connected to the purpose of study. The results provide findings with some interpretation of the results. | The results attempt to present findings but might be unclear OR some information is missing from the results. | The results attempt to present findings but might be unclear AND some information is missing from the results. | The results do not present concrete data, they are unclear findings, and/or do not relate to the study purpose. | No data is provided, or states that in the future some data will be reported. |
| Conclusion | The conclusion is fully supported by the study results. | The conclusion is mostly supported by the study results. | The conclusion is only partially supported by the study results. | The conclusion is weakly supported by the study results. | The conclusion is not supported by the study results. | Not provided. |
| Significance | The data presented are ground-breaking and of exceptional importance for the field. | The data presented are of high importance for the field. | The data presented are important for the field. | The data presented are informative for the field. | The data presented are of some relevance for the field. | |

Stem Cells, Cell Therapy and Bioengineering in Lung Biology and Disease

Conflict of Interest Policy for Abstract Evaluation

It is particularly important that there be neither actual bias nor the appearance of bias in the evaluation process. If a member of the Committee or ad hoc reviewer has close ties with an applicant or applicant's research advisor **and** subsequently participates in the grading process for that applicant, this can create the appearance of bias (whether or not there is actually bias involved). Therefore, the following policy outlines the procedures guiding the participation of members of the Committee and ad hoc reviewers in the evaluation and scoring of the applications.

Conflict of interest policy

A. Committee members or ad hoc reviewers whose trainee or collaborator is an applicant will recuse themselves from part of the review process, and they should not be involved in evaluating that application in any capacity. **It is incumbent on the committee member or ad hoc reviewer to inform the committee chair as soon as they are aware of the conflict of interest.** This will allow the chair to ensure that the reviewer is not assigned that abstract to evaluate.

B. Committee members or ad hoc reviewers who are co-authors on an abstract will recuse themselves from part of the evaluation process. They should not be involved in evaluating any applications on which they are a co-author. **It is incumbent on the committee member or ad hoc reviewer to inform the committee chair as soon as they are aware of the conflict of interest.** This will allow the chair to ensure that the reviewer is not assigned their own co-author's application to evaluate.

C. Committee members and ad hoc reviewers who are in the applicant's department or work closely with or collaborate with any abstract author will recuse themselves from part of the evaluation process. Reviewers who are in the author's department or work closely with/collaborate with the author also have a perceived, if not direct, conflict of interest and should, at minimum, recuse themselves from evaluating that specific application. However, the reviewer can be involved in evaluating other applications. **It is incumbent on the committee member or ad hoc reviewer to inform the committee chair as soon as s/he is aware of the conflict, including information on the level of collaboration between the reviewer and author.** This will allow the chair to ensure that the reviewer is not assigned to evaluate any applications for which they have a potential conflict of interest.

For questions regarding this policy, please contact the Chair of the Junior Planning Committee, Rob Hynds (rob.hynds@ucl.ac.uk) or Conference Chair, Amy Ryan (amy-l-ryan@uiowa.edu) or Conference Vice-Chair, Chelsea Magin (chelsea.magin@cuanschtz.edu).