

Scoring Rubric For 2026 ZWHC Abstracts

	0	1	2	3	4	5
Scientific Writing	Submission incomplete	Abstract poorly written - difficult to follow due to spelling and grammatical errors. Extended abstracts and full papers poorly referenced. Does not adhere to the abstract submission guidelines. Would need a complete rewrite.	Abstract mostly clear but some significant issues with language /style (e.g. non scientific style, spelling and grammatical errors). Lack of references in extended abstracts and full papers. Would require major rewrite.	Abstract and title are ok. The meaning is clear, but the writing could be significantly improved. Referencing (for extended abstracts and full papers) could be improved (some statements not referenced, some references not clearly relating to the statements made).	Abstract and title are well written and adhere to the guidelines. Easy to follow but some small typos or grammatical errors requiring minor corrections. Extended abstracts and full papers generally appropriately referenced.	Abstract and title adhere to the submission guidelines. Abstract is clearly written, concise and engaging. Extended abstracts and full papers have references that are relevant and useful. Title is concise and conveys essence of study. No corrections required.
Relevance	Topic of abstract irrelevant to zoo and wildlife health conference.	Abstract does not address implications to zoo and wildlife health practice.	Abstract/findings have little implication to zoo and wildlife health (of minor interest only).	Abstract/findings have moderate relevance for zoo and wildlife health. Topic may only be relevant to some of the conference participants.	Abstract/findings relevant to the conferece. Findings are likely to provide new information to many wildlife clinician/ managers/ policy makers.	Abstract/findings highly applicable to zoo and wildlife health. Findings have significant implications for wilidlife clinicians/ managers/ policy makers.
Scientific Validity	Aim of the study is absent, not clear, or does not relate to the study. Abstract is too vague and poorly referenced (extended abstracts and full papers only) to make a valid assessment.	Aim of the study is not clear or is absent. Methods used are unclear. The discussion and conclusions are not clearly related to the results or misinterpret the results.	The aims, methods and results a little confusing, such that this study would not easily be reproducible. Some information is missing. Difficult to assess whether the conculsions are valid.	The aims, methods and results are fairly clear, with only minor issues. Some methods used may not be the most appropriate, but there is merit to the study. The discussion and conclusions address the findings of the study.	The aims, methods and results are clearly stated and appropriate to the study. The study is reproducible but the manuscript could be improved by providing more detail. The discussion and conclusions clearly address findings of the study.	Study is clearly laid out and reproducible. Aims and methods are clear and appropriate to the study. Results are clearly laid out. The discussion and conclusions are well structured, a valid reflection of the results and explain the relevance of the study.
Originality	Abstract is too vague to make a valid assessment.	The topic does not present any new material and shows poor review of literature.	The study provides little new information.	Some new information but not neccesarly of great significance for our audience.	This abstract offers new information that is not already well-documented in the scientific literature.	New, unpublished material demonstrating a novel approach, new techniques or significant change in thinking. Methods and/or aims of the study are novel.