

**Academy of Acute Care Physical Therapy  
Combined Sections Meeting - Abstract Reviewer Form**

ID # \_\_\_\_\_

Format: POSTER \_\_\_\_\_

PLATFORM \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Overall Abstract Score:** \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Does not have to equal the average of the significance, approach, writing.)*

**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**