### Academy of Acute Care Physical Therapy

#### Combined Sections Meeting - Abstract Reviewer Form

**ID #__________**

**Format:**

- POSTER_____
- PLATFORM_____

**Overall Abstract Score:**

(Does not have to equal the average of the significance, approach, writing.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional (exceptionally strong, no weaknesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outstanding (extremely strong, minor weakness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent (very strong with some minor weaknesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very good (strong, numerous minor weaknesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good (strong, at least one moderate weakness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfactory (some strengths, moderate weakness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair (some strength, moderate weaknesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marginal (few strengths, major weakness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor (few strengths, numerous major weaknesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-reject (any strengths cannot be overcome by serious weaknesses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Significance:** Does the work address a problem or a critical barrier to progress in acute care physical therapy? How will the work improve scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice? Will the work generate interest for Section members?

*Score:*

*Comments:*

1 = Landmark work of interest to nearly all members.
3 = Important work of great interest to some members and of some interest to most members.
5 = Results are of average importance.
7 = Not very important work for field but does have some indirect relevance to acute care practice.
9 = Has no real impact for acute care rehabilitation.

**2. Approach:** Research abstract design must include Purpose, Method, Results, and Conclusion. Clinical/Special Interest abstracts must include: Purpose, Case or Clinical Application Description, Outcomes/Discussion, Conclusion/Significance/ Clinical Merit. Add one point for any lacking element. Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate for the objective? Does the project address protection of confidentiality and/or for protection of human subjects?

*Score:*

*Comments:*

1 = Outstanding concept with clinical implications well-articulated.
3 = Well planned, logical sequence, completed without flaws.
5 = Fundamentally sound work with some minor deficits in case description, outcomes, or clinical applications.
7 = Significant deficits in purpose or case description, results or conclusion absent.
9 = Contains fundamental flaws in presentation; unable to identify any discrete acute care clinical implications.

**3. Quality of Writing:** Is the abstract logical and well-organized? Is the objective well-defined and answered in the results/conclusion section?

*Score:*

*Comments:*

1 = Logical, organized, clearly written.
3 = Generally well-written, major points clear, style acceptable but not outstanding (people first language).
5 = Some flaws that may hinder understanding of minor points.
7 = Reader must exert effort to understand major and minor points.
9 = Difficult to understand and poorly organized.

**Recommendation:**

- _____ accept as platform
- _____ accept as poster
- _____ reject
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