

## Review of Submitted Abstracts

### VAS Posters on the Hill

**Instructions:**

**Abstracts rated 'Unacceptable' in any category will not be accepted. Abstracts rated 'Poor' in one or more categories may be denied acceptance if presentation time/space is limited. This page is a reference for the submission reviewers. Reviewers are asked to enter their scores into the online form where final results will be tabulated.**

	4-Excellent	3-Good	2-Poor	1-Unacceptable
Appeal and Originality*	Research is innovative and original with obvious relevance to the field.	Research is original with clear relevance to the field.	Review of literature or previous research: originality of findings from the review is implied but vague.	Review of literature or previous research: does not appear relevant and/or the findings are merely a summary of previous work and/or involve plagiarism.
Methodology	Methods are ideal for stated purpose. Students play a primary role in research.	Methods are appropriate and students' role is significant.	Methods are questionable or students' role is minimal.	Methods are inappropriate or research was not performed by students.
Clarity	Abstract is well-written, void of mistakes, and makes purpose, relevance, and methods clear.	Abstract is mostly well written, leaving only minimal lack of clarity.	Abstract is poorly written, leaving questions about the purpose, relevance, and methods of the research.	Poor writing quality and clarity make it difficult to judge the abstract at all.

\*Originality: Abstracts should clearly state the novel contribution to the field. When new data has been collected, this is unambiguously original research. However, different or improved analyses of previously reported data also represent original work. Finally, a literature review can also be considered original research if the author of the review brings new perspectives to the questions considered by combining the findings of many studies (in the case of literature reviews, do not assume that the proposals committee will recognize research as original; clearly state which findings or perspectives are new discoveries enabled by the review process).