

# Abstract Assessment Form

**1-4 November 2021**

This abstract assessment form explains the abstract scoring system for presentation submissions and may be referred to by reviewers as a working document when assessing each paper. The Scientific Committee asks reviewers for an ITEM SCORE ranging from 0 (unacceptable) to 5 (excellent) for each ITEM (criteria): Relevance, Method, Conclusions, and Overall Quality.

Reviewers should submit all scores through the website. A SUM SCORE is then auto-calculated by the website.

Based on the SUM SCORE, several threshold values are used to determine submission acceptance. If the score for any item is 0 (Unacceptable), the paper will be rejected. For SUM SCORES, an abstract should normally achieve a score of 10 or higher to be accepted as either poster or podium presentation. The Scientific Committee will set the threshold for a podium (i.e. oral) presentation based on the number of time slots available for podium presentations (as an indication, this threshold will normally be higher than 10, e.g. approximately 12). Papers with a SUM SCORE of 18 or higher will normally be considered by a jury of Scientific Committee members for the best paper award at the congress based on the presentation given.

Item (Criteria)	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)
<b>Relevance</b>	The study is not related to prosthetics and orthotics and has no clinical or theoretical relevance.	Although the study is related to prosthetics and orthotics, it has no clinical or theoretical relevance.	The study has limited clinical or theoretical relevance to issues in prosthetics and orthotics, but the connection is not clearly described.	The study <b>may</b> in time contribute to the advancement of clinical or theoretical issues in prosthetics and orthotics.	The study <b>can</b> indirectly contribute to the advancement of clinical or theoretical issues in prosthetics and orthotics.	The study is directly and immediately applicable to clinical or theoretical issues in prosthetics and orthotics.
<b>Method</b>	The method is not described.	The method is flawed.	The method is poorly described and/or more appropriate methods should have been considered.	The method is reasonably well described and seems appropriate.	The method is appropriate and described in reasonable detail given the constraints of space. If applicable, issues of validity and reliability have been considered.	The method is very clear, comprehensive, and well described given the constraints of space. If applicable, the method is valid, reliable and appropriate.
<b>Conclusions</b>	No clear conclusion is drawn or the conclusions are unsupported by the study.	The conclusions drawn are not correct based on the information presented.	The conclusions represent a biased interpretation of the study. Alternate interpretations are possible.	The conclusions are reasonable, but greater consideration of alternate interpretations or limitations of the study are warranted.	The conclusions are supported by the results. Some consideration has been given to alternate interpretations and limitations.	The conclusions are supported by the results. Careful consideration has been given to alternate interpretations and limitations.
<b>Overall</b> (including the quality of English and presentation)	The abstract is unacceptable because of very poor grammar or spelling OR the abstract presents insufficient information for an appropriate review OR the abstract length exceeds the specified length OR the abstract is not in the correct format.	Editorial revisions are required to address poor grammar or spelling before inclusion in the proceedings. Overall, the abstract provides a poor impression of the presentation.	The standard of English expression is fair. Overall, the abstract provides a fair impression of the presentation.	A good standard of English expression with correct grammar and spelling. Overall, the abstract provides a good impression of the presentation.	Very good standard of English expression with correct grammar and spelling. Overall, the abstract provides a very good impression of the presentation.	Very clear presentation with correct grammar and spelling that maximizes information content within the allocated space. Overall, the abstract provides an excellent impression of the presentation.

**Note: A score for each item for each submission reviewed must be submitted through the ISPO2021 abstract rating website.**