### Poster Abstract Review Criteria Rubric

Each criterion will be scored from 1 (criteria is not met) to 5 (criteria is exceeded). Abstracts that fail to include all required components will automatically be rejected (either for further editing/clarification/modification or outright). No re-submissions will be allowed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality and Relevance</th>
<th>Innovation and Originality</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does not adequately address criteria (1)</strong></td>
<td>The topic is not current, innovative, original, or groundbreaking. Attendees are unlikely to gain new knowledge or insights.</td>
<td>The activity is not described, or the description does not provide any relevant context, and/or the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addresses criteria with substantial weakness (2)</strong></td>
<td>The topic may be current, but not particularly original, innovative, or groundbreaking. Attendees may not be likely to gain new knowledge or insights.</td>
<td>The activity is not clearly described or lacks sufficient detail; the description provides little relevant context and/or the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adequately addresses criteria (3)</strong></td>
<td>The topic is current and fairly original, if not innovative or groundbreaking. Attendees may gain new knowledge and insights.</td>
<td>The activity is adequately described; the description provides some relevant context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly addresses criteria (4)</strong></td>
<td>The topic is current, original, innovative, and groundbreaking for at least some participants. Attendees are likely to gain new knowledge and insights.</td>
<td>The activity is clearly described; the description provides relevant context and the rationale for the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceeds expectations in addressing criteria (5)</strong></td>
<td>The topic is cutting-edge, thought-provoking, innovative, and groundbreaking for many participants. Attendees are very likely to gain new knowledge and insights.</td>
<td>The activity is very clearly described; the description provides all relevant context and the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Quality and Relevance:
  - The topic is not relevant, not current, and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field. It does not appear to be of value or a worthwhile poster for ASMCUE attendees.
  - The topic is only tangentially related to the field and is not current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience. It may not be a worthwhile poster, or its value might be limited to a narrow group.
  - The topic may not be current, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience. It might be a worthwhile poster for some ASMCUE attendees.
  - The topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a worthwhile poster. Likely to be a worthwhile poster, possibly for multiple groups.
  - The topic is current, relevant, groundbreaking, or significant to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a very worthwhile poster. Likely to be a very worthwhile poster for multiple groups.

- Innovation and Originality:
  - The topic is not current, innovative, original, or groundbreaking. Attendees are unlikely to gain new knowledge or insights.
  - The topic may be current, but not particularly original, innovative, or groundbreaking. Attendees may not be likely to gain new knowledge or insights.
  - The topic is current and fairly original, if not innovative or groundbreaking. Attendees may gain new knowledge and insights.
  - The topic is current, original, innovative, and groundbreaking for at least some participants. Attendees are likely to gain new knowledge and insights.
  - The topic is cutting-edge, thought-provoking, innovative, and groundbreaking for many participants. Attendees are very likely to gain new knowledge and insights.

- Background:
  - The activity is not described, or the description does not provide any relevant context, and/or the
  - The activity is not clearly described or lacks sufficient detail; the description provides little relevant context and/or the
  - The activity is adequately described; the description provides some relevant context
  - The activity is clearly described; the description provides relevant context and the rationale for the activity
  - The activity is very clearly described; the description provides all relevant context and the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rationale for the activity cannot be inferred.</th>
<th>rationale for the activity takes effort to infer.</th>
<th>and/or rationale for the activity can be easily inferred.</th>
<th>is stated or clearly implied.</th>
<th>rationale for the activity is explicitly stated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis Statement</strong></td>
<td>There is a lack of hypothesis statement.</td>
<td>There is a hypothesis statement, but it is not related to the project described and/or is not clearly defined.</td>
<td>The hypothesis statement is adequate.</td>
<td>The hypothesis statement is clearly described and follows precisely from the rationale provided in the background.</td>
<td>The hypothesis is clearly and concisely described. In addition, the hypothesis follows from the rationale provided in the background and is limited to one specific testing variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Design &amp; Methods</strong></td>
<td>There is a complete lack of methods.</td>
<td>There is a brief explanation of the methods, but not enough information is provided to test the hypothesis and/or provide context for the results.</td>
<td>The methods are adequately described.</td>
<td>The methods provide all relevant information necessary to understand how the hypothesis will be tested and how the results will confirm/reject the hypothesis.</td>
<td>The methods are clearly and concisely described so the reader can easily see how the author is testing their hypothesis and how the results will confirm or reject that hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data supporting effectiveness of strategy</strong></td>
<td>There is a complete lack of data stemming from the hypothesis.</td>
<td>The data provided has some relevance but does not follow from the methods and/or the hypothesis.</td>
<td>The data generated is adequate and stems directly from the hypothesis statement.</td>
<td>The data generated is adequate, stems from the hypothesis, and is sufficient to provide context for a preliminary conclusion.</td>
<td>The data generated is solid, stems from the hypothesis, and is more than sufficient to provide context for a conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>There is complete lack of concluding statement.</td>
<td>The concluding statement is not supported from the data provided and/or does not address the hypothesis.</td>
<td>The concluding statement is adequate – it addresses the hypothesis or stems from the data.</td>
<td>The concluding statement addresses the hypothesis and stems directly from the data provided.</td>
<td>The concluding statement is clearly and concisely written. In addition, it addresses the hypothesis and directly stems from the data provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adoption</strong></td>
<td>For others to adopt this project, it requires very specific equipment that is likely not available or too complex that it requires to many site-specific variables.</td>
<td>This project can be utilized by others, but may require a significant amount of time to implement.</td>
<td>This project can be adapted may not be overly difficult to do so, but may require a significant amount of time to do so.</td>
<td>This project can be implemented right away but some minor variables may need to be adapted.</td>
<td>This project can be implemented right away with very little difficulty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>