**SNRS Criteria for Research-Related Abstracts**

Abstract Number and Title \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unsatisfactory= 0 | Fair= 1 point | Good= 2 points | Excellent = 3 points | **Score** |
| **Abstract Title** | Title appears unrelated to abstract content. | Abstract title does not closely align with content of abstract(s). | Abstract title shows congruency with content and purpose | Abstract title is engaging and accurately reflects content and purpose |  |
| **Introduction/**  **Significance to SNRS Attendees** | Significance of the topic is not described | Significance is described, may be interesting, but not consistent with needs of SNRS attendees. | Somewhat relevant topic, which will appeal to some SNRS attendees. | Topic is highly relevant, timely, and is likely to have broad appeal |  |
| **Content is Aligned or Supports the Conference Theme** | Not aligned | Topic is in some way related to, or supportive of, the theme | Clear alignment with conference theme | Aligned and will clearly add value to the upcoming conference |  |
| **Innovation** | Content and/or methodology is redundant or nothing new | Content is appropriate, but not innovative | Information has been presented before, but remains relevant | Creative, exciting, forward-thinking in content &/or presentation style |  |
| **Well-written and Follows Guidelines** | Errors in spelling, grammar, etc. | Grammatically correct, but does not follow guidelines | Well-written, follows guidelines | Professionally written; content expertise is apparent; follows guidelines. |  |
| **For Reviewer: Additional Comments and Total Score** | | | | |  |
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