**Abstract Evaluation Rubric (*Non-case report/series*)**

| **Criterion** | **Excellent** **(5)** | **Good** **(4)** | **Satisfactory** **(3)** | **Needs Improvement (2)** | **Poor** **(1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Background/Rationale** | Exceptional and relevant | Solid & relevant | Acceptable | Insufficient | Not included |
| **Objective(s)** | Clear, well-defined, significant novelty/implications | Clear, defined, but may not be significantly novel | Present but lacks some clarity & originality | Poorly defined, lacks focus | Not included |
| **Methods** | Clear, detailed, appropriate; clearly linked to objective(s). | Clear and appropriately linked to objective(s) but lack some detail or specificity. | Methods are described, but lack clarity, detail, or relevance to objective(s). | Unclear / inappropriate | Not described |
| **Conclusion** | Clear and insightful; well-justified and directly tied to the results; discusses implications for the field | Clear, insightful, tied to results, but does not discuss implications | Present, restates results without insightful conclusion | Unclear, unsupported by results, or poorly developed | Not included |
| **Clarity and Organization** | Well-organized, easy to follow, clear writing with no grammatical or typographical errors | Generally well-organized and clear, with minor issues in writing or organization | Some issues with organization or clarity, some grammatical or typographical errors | Poorly organized or unclear, multiple grammatical or typographical errors | Disorganized and unclear; difficult to read or follow |