



Abstract Scoring Rubric

Used across the AAA to objectively assess submitted conference abstracts. Abstract scores will inform the Program Committee, Committee for Early Career Anatomists (CECA), and the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) as they select conference speakers and award finalists.

Abstract Section	Brief Explanation of the Section. "Tell the reader ..."	Exemplary	Well Done	Expected	Developing	Emerging	Missing
Introduction (10 points)	<i>... that you have thoughtfully reviewed the literature and have developed an in-depth understanding of the field."</i> <i>Suggested length is 3-5 sentences.</i>	The introduction strongly demonstrates that the literature has been thoroughly reviewed. The introduction is a clear, detailed, and concise overview of the problem. The knowledge gap is clearly stated. (10 / 10)	(8 / 10)	The introduction demonstrates that the literature has been adequately reviewed. The introduction provides a clear and somewhat concise overview of the problem, but with some gaps. The knowledge gap can be inferred. (6 / 10)	(4 / 10)	The introduction does not demonstrate that the literature has been reviewed. The introduction provides an inadequate overview of the problem. The knowledge gap is unclear. (2 / 10)	A review of literature is missing. The overview of the problem is missing. The knowledge gap is missing. (0 / 10)
Research Question / Objective (5 points)	<i>... exactly what your research project sought to accomplish. Be sure to justify the scientific merit of the research question / objective."</i> <i>Suggested length is 1-3 sentences.</i>	Based on the presented background and knowledge gap, a specific and clear research question / objective is stated. The research question / objective is clearly justified. (5 / 5)	(4 / 5)	Based on the presented background and knowledge gap, a research question / objective can be inferred. The justification of the research question / objective can be inferred. (3 / 5)	(2 / 5)	A misguided or unreasonable research question / objective is stated that is not directly linked to the presented background. The justification provided does not align with the research question / objective. (1 / 5)	The research question / objective is missing. The justification is missing. (0 / 5)
Materials and Methods (10 points)	<i>... exactly how you conducted your research, including (if appropriate) information about your sample, data collection process, and technique/approach for data analysis."</i> <i>Suggested length is 3-5 sentences.</i>	The methods provide a strong, clear, organized explanation of the methodology. The methodology is most appropriate to answer the research question / objective. (10 / 10)	(8 / 10)	The methods provide an adequate explanation of the proposed methodology, but with some missing information. It is unclear if the methodology is most appropriate to answer the research question / objective. (6 / 10)	(4 / 10)	The methods provide an unclear and/or unorganized explanation of the methodology. The methods provide insufficient information. The methodology is not most appropriate to answer the research question / objective. (2 / 10)	The methodology is inappropriate or missing. (0 / 10)

Abstract Section	Brief Explanation of the Section. "Tell the reader ..."	Exemplary	Well Done	Expected	Developing	Emerging	Missing
Results (10 points)	<i>... a summary of the data that was collected and the results of the analyses conducted. Be sure not to interpret the data."</i> <i>Suggested length is 3-5 sentences.</i>	The results are clear and directly align with the research question / objective. The results strictly follow the presentation of the methods. The results provide data without interpretation. (10 / 10)	(8 / 10)	The results are somewhat aligned with the research question / objective. The results mainly follow the presentation of the methods. The results are missing some information. (6 / 10)	(4 / 10)	The results are unclear, they do not present concrete data, and/or they do not align with the research question / objective. Results do not follow the presentation of the methods. The results inappropriately interpret the data. (2 / 10)	The results are missing, perhaps due to the early submission of an abstract for an incomplete/ongoing project. (0 / 10)
Discussion (5 points)	<i>... the interpretation of your data, with an explanation of how your research fits within the broader context of the field."</i> <i>Suggested length is ~3 sentences.</i>	The discussion is explicitly informed by / linked to the presented results. The discussion clearly contextualizes the work within the broader field. (5 / 5)	(4 / 5)	The discussion is partially informed by / linked to the presented results. The discussion provides only some context of the work. (3 / 5)	(2 / 5)	The discussion is weakly informed by / linked to the presented results. The discussion poorly contextualizes the work within the broader field. (1 / 5)	The discussion is not linked to the presented results or missing. The discussion does not contextualize the work within the broader field (0 / 5)
Significance and Implications (10 points)	<i>... the impact of your research. Convince the reader, within the limits of your scope, that your work is important. Be sure to state how this research has either advanced or contributed to the field."</i> <i>Suggested length is ~3 sentences.</i>	The importance of the work is clearly communicated using a well-structured, logical argument, that is fully supported by the study results. An advancement to the field has been clearly communicated. (10 / 10)	(8 / 10)	The importance of the work can be interpreted from a structured argument, but is only partially supported by the study results. A contribution to the field has been communicated. (6 / 10)	(4 / 5)	The importance of the work is unclear and/or is not supported by the study results. It remains unclear how the work contributes to the field. (2 / 10)	The statement of significance is missing. The work does not advance nor contribute to the field. (0 / 10)
Total = / 50							