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I. Overview of Abstract Selection Process

The original science presentations are the heart of the program and give the membership, guests and trainees of the Societies an opportunity to present their original work. Your role in the review process is integral to the annual program.

You will review abstracts that have been submitted to a subspecialty area for the 2012 PAS Annual Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts. All abstracts must be submitted to one of the subspecialty designations.

In addition, the abstract submitter had the option of having this same abstract considered thematically. Approximately 80% of the submitted abstracts are considered in a theme. Abstracts submitted to a theme are reviewed by a Theme Review Team in addition to the Subspecialty Review Team. Choice of abstracts for thematic sessions is the very first step taken by the PAS Program Committee. Thematic sessions often include the most highly rated abstracts.

The Program Committee is dedicated to the development of abstract programs that encourage groups of abstracts for presentation among those authors with similar scientific or clinical interests, regardless of subspecialty. Subspecialty topic designation is used as an additional factor in the program development.

II. Timeline for Program Development

November 23  Coordinators and Reviewers Begin On-Line Abstract Grading.


December 12 Review Scoring Deadline (5:00pm CST).

Dec 13 – 21 Scores and comments compiled, averaged and transmitted to the PAS Program Office.

December 22 Rank Order Reports are made available to PAS Program Committee Coordinating Chairs for your Review Team.

Dec 27 – Jan 5 The Coordinating Chair has the option to schedule a Review Team conference call to discuss potential programming of the abstracts. The Chair will notify you directly if a call will be organized during this period.

January 5 Theme program submissions due to PAS Program Office (by Coordinating Chairs).

January 14 Program Committee meets to finalize abstract programs (The Woodlands, TX).

III. General Submission Policies

The policies noted below are policies and guidelines communicated to authors regarding the submission of abstracts. Please take these policies into consideration as you score abstracts.

- Abstracts submitted or presented to other societies or national meetings can be submitted for consideration for the 2012 PAS Annual Meeting.

Research published in manuscript form prior to the submission of the abstract (November 17) is not appropriate and should not be submitted. If data contained in the abstract is published after submission of the abstract, the PAS Central Office must be notified by the abstract submitter regardless of timing as soon as
publication is recognized. At that time a member of the PAS Program Committee makes a determination concerning presentation.

- Historically, abstracts accepted for presentation are hypothesis-driven new work. Abstracts rarely accepted for presentation include single case reports, open label drug trials, highly speculative accounts of clinical experience, and accounts of personal experience.

- Interim results from ongoing clinical trials should not be accepted for presentation unless the study has been prematurely closed for efficacy, lack of efficacy, or issues of safety.

- The submission of abstracts without data because investigations or analyses are incomplete shall be evaluated only on the basis of the information contained in the abstract.

- There is no limit on the number of abstracts submitted by each member, but the submission of multiple, similar abstracts from the same investigator(s) or laboratory has been strongly discouraged.

## IV. Online Grading Process

*Abstract review MUST be completed by 5:00pm (CST) on Monday, December 12.*

You will use an online grading program for review and scoring of your abstracts. You will receive an email on November 23 indicating that the website is ready for you to begin reviewing those abstracts assigned to you for review.

To begin reviewing, you will open your web browser and go to the internet address provided in that email. You will then be asked to enter your unique user name and password.

NOTE: If you agreed to review abstracts in more than one subspecialty or theme area, you will be able to access, review and grade ALL abstracts in your areas using the same username and password combination.

You have **two** options for reviewing the abstracts assigned to you:

1. You can review the abstracts online and then as you review you can assign each abstract a score, indicate a presentation type, and add additional comments; or

2. You may print the abstracts, read them off-line, and then return to the program to record your grades, presentation type, and comments.

### Special Note of Importance Regarding Electronic Abstract Submissions

Abstract submissions were prepared in an electronic format requiring special coding for various special characters and table alignments. Accordingly, abstract text might include special codes or formats that did not translate well during the final print out. These codes may appear in their original mark ups on your copy. This is not the fault of the authors; please disregard formatting issues in your review process.

If you have an abstract in which the scientific content is difficult to determine because of a potential formatting or coding problem, please contact our office (review@pas-meeting.org or 281-419-0052) and we will get the correct information to you.
V. Review and Scoring Guidelines

All reviewers should use the online grader to enter scores and presentation format recommendations: platform (PL) versus poster symposia (PS) versus poster (PO) preferences of most abstracts. (The description of these presentation types is noted later in these instructions.) Abstracts that might be newsworthy should be noted as well.

- The review process must be completed by 5:00pm (CST) on December 12.
- The content of all abstracts is to be kept confidential and authors should not be contacted.

NOTE: For faster loading, abstracts in each area are compiled into groups of 20. If the subspecialty or theme area in which you are reviewing received more than 20 submitted abstracts, you are responsible for reviewing abstracts in ALL groups.

Scores and comments will be compiled, averaged and transmitted to the PAS Program Committee Coordinating Chair(s) for your Review Team. The PAS Program Committee will meet to finalize abstract programs on January 14.

Key Points to Remember:
- Use the entire scale from 1 to 7; if you give all abstracts 3s and 4s, the Program Committee will be unable to identify the best abstracts. The online Grading Program will show you the average of the scores that you have assigned (in each area of review, if you have agreed to review in more than one area).
- The best abstracts present data or tell a story that is new, true and important.
- Identify thematic content that might permit a platform session or poster cluster to be compiled (use the Comments section).

Grading Scale

Grade all abstracts assigning a score from 1 (best) to 7 (worst). For subspecialty/theme areas with three or more reviewers, you are asked not to rank an abstract from your own institution; average scores will be based on the rankings from the other reviewers.

1. Best abstracts in category/topic area
2. Excellent → outstanding
3. Very good → excellent
4. Good – solid
5. Acceptable
6. Borderline acceptability
7. Do not accept

X. Deferred—paper is from reviewer’s Lab, Department, Program, or Institution.

Ratings 1 – 4: Imply that the abstract is worthy of presentation.
Ratings 5 – 6: Might still merit presentation if the existing literature on the topic is inconsistent or meager, or if the observation is potentially provocative.
Rating 7: Implies strongly that an abstract must not be presented.
Criteria to be Considered for Scoring

You may “weigh” the following characteristics as you see fit. For example, the importance of the topic might be considered so great as to outweigh some problems with research design and analysis. Or, the design may be so inadequate that despite the importance of the topic the abstract is borderline acceptable or unacceptable.

Originality: Were novel concepts or approaches used? Does the abstract challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies? If the abstract presents an extension or a replication of previous work, is the new study better than previous ones, and therefore adds genuinely new information to present knowledge, or provides clear information that was in doubt due to small sample sizes or other design issues?

Scientific merit; importance: Does the abstract address an important problem? How was scientific knowledge advanced? What will be the effect of the results on the concepts or methods that drive the field? Are the results and conclusions strong enough to influence how clinicians/teachers/researchers “act”; understand the basic mechanisms of health/disease; or provide health services or trainee education, conduct future research, or impact public policy?

Quality of research design and data analysis: Is the study design clearly described? Are sampling procedures adequately described, including inclusion and exclusion criteria? Is there potential selection bias in the sampling procedure and is there enough information for the reviewer to be able to evaluate this problem? Are possible confounding factors discussed and/or controlled for? Are issues of reliability and validity of the measures addressed? Are the statistical analyses appropriate for the study design? Are the statistical analyses the best that could have been used? Is there an adequate discussion of the statistical power of the study?

Conclusions: Are conclusions clearly stated? How well are the conclusions justified by the data? Are conclusions correct but overstated for the strength of the study?

Quality of presentation: Is the abstract clearly written and understandable? Has the researcher followed the directions for submission; e.g., are unique abbreviations spelled out clearly the first time they are used?

Presentation Formats

Designate those abstracts, regardless of score, that would best be presented as platform presentations (PL), that would best be suited for poster symposia (PS), or that would best be presented as poster presentations (PO). The Program Committee makes final determination on the format for the presentation for original science presentations. Your input is helpful to the Coordinating Chair(s) who will organize the final program. Brief comments are also valuable and may be added in the online grading program.

Format Descriptions

Platform Session (PL)—Platform sessions are 2-hour sessions with 8 papers. Each paper is afforded 15 minutes for the presentation (10-minute oral presentation; 5 minutes for audience discussion). Oral presentations are selected and assembled on the basis of their thematic content or as part of traditional subspecialty sessions.

Poster Symposia (PS)—Poster symposia are 2-hour sessions and include 10–12 grouped posters with a viewing period and a formal presentation or discussion period. There is some flexibility with the format for the formal presentation period. Session moderators, who are chosen by the Program Committee, determine the final format for each individual poster symposia session. The goal of the poster symposia format is to encourage participant and audience interaction in a less formal setting than a platform session. Poster Symposia presentations are selected and assembled on the basis of their thematic content or as part of traditional subspecialty sessions.
Poster Sessions (PO)—The bulk of the original science is presented in a poster session format. Poster sessions are 2-3 hour sessions with 250–400 posters on various thematic and traditional subspecialty topics. Authors are required to be in attendance for a 2-hour period and can discuss their work with individual attendees in an informal setting.

Newsworthy Abstracts
Indicate abstracts that might be newsworthy and should be directed to the media by typing “newsworthy” in the comments section (along with any other comments you might have).

Submission Violations
Notify the PAS office at 281-419-0052 (or by email to review@pas-meeting.org) immediately if:

- You identify an abstract that has already been published in manuscript form;
- You identify an abstract that has not included an acknowledgment of funding sources of a commercial nature and/or consulting or holding of significant equity in a company that could be affected by the results of the study. Authors have been instructed that this must appear as the last sentence of the abstract, if pertinent.

VI. Staff Contact and Technical Support
If you have any questions or concerns please contact:

Debbie Anagnostelis, PAS Meeting Director
Phone: 281-419-0052
Email: debbie@aps-spr.org

or for technical support using the grader:

Marathon Multimedia Technical Support
Primary Contact for Technical Support
Phone: 1-866-759-5440 or 507-333-1000
Email: support@marathonmultimedia.com

Belinda Thomas, Information Services Coordinator
Phone: 281-419-0052
Email: review@pas-meeting.org