PAS 2021 VIRTUAL
Pediatric Academic Societies

ABSTRACT REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS

Online Review and Scoring Begins: Tuesday, Jan. 12, 2021 6:00 pm (Eastern)
(you will be notified by email when the site is live)

Online Review and Scoring Deadline: Monday, Jan. 25, 2021 11:59 pm (Eastern)

Please read all instructions carefully before you begin.

Contents

Overview of Abstract Selection Process

The original science presentations are the heart of the program and give members of the pediatric academic community 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 Pediatric Academic Societies 2021 Meeting, which will be held in a virtual format, with Phase I April 30-May 4 and Phase II May 10-June 4. All abstracts must be submitted to one of the subspecialty designations.

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.

Timeline for Program Development

Jan. 12	Reviewers begin online abstract scoring
Jan. 25	**Review Scoring Deadline 11:59pm EST**
Jan. 26	Scores and comments are compiled, averaged, and transmitted to the PAS Program Office.
Jan. 27	Rank order reports are made available to PAS Program Committee Coordinating Chairs.
Jan. 27 – Feb. 9	Coordinating Chairs work together to session abstracts into program formats.
Feb. 10	Program Committee finalizes abstract programs.

General Submission Policies

The following policies and guidelines were 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 PAS 2021 Meeting.

Research **published in manuscript form prior to the submission** of the abstract deadline (January 5) is not appropriate and should not be submitted. If data contained in the abstract is published **after submission** of the abstract, the PAS Program Office must be notified by the abstract submitter regardless of timing as soon as publication is recognized. At that time, the Program Committee Chair will make a determination concerning presentation at the PAS Meeting.

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 author, but the submission of multiple, redundant, or highly similar abstracts with only minimal changes in the abstract title or minor changes in data analysis from the same investigator(s) or laboratory is strongly discouraged. Such submissions may result in rejection of all abstracts that are deemed to be in violation of PAS guidelines; rejection may occur prior to, during or after review, even if submitted to different topical categories.

Preparation Before Starting to Score Abstracts

We highly recommend you read the following journal article "A Practical Guide to Writing and Reviewing Abstracts for Pediatric Academic Meetings" before you start to score abstracts. It can be downloaded at this link:

http://hosppeds.aappublications.org/content/hosppeds/6/6/369.full.pdf

Online Scoring Process
Abstract review MUST be completed by 11:59pm (EST) on Monday, January 25.

Please review the **video tutorial** about the abstract review process.

You will use an online scoring program for review and scoring of abstracts. You will receive an email on January 12 indicating that the website is ready for you to begin reviewing those abstracts assigned to you for review.

To begin reviewing, access the PAS Program & Events Center and enter your user ID and password. Select the "Review" tab and you will see the list of abstracts assigned to you for review.

Instructions for Online Review in ScholarOne
To view each abstract, click on the abstract number under **Control ID**. Boxes will appear for you to add Confidential Comments or Comments for the Authors.

You can review the abstracts online, assigning each abstract a score and any comments. If you would like to, you may print the abstracts, read them offline, and then return to the program to record your grades and comments.

To print all abstracts, click on the box to the left of the Control ID, which will mark all abstracts. Then click **Print Selected**; a pdf of all abstracts, tables, and images will be created. To print a few abstracts, click the box next to each abstract to be printed and click on **Print Selected.**

Enter scores for a submission by clicking in the scoring column and choosing a value from the dropdown; all information is saved automatically after it is entered. A green check mark ✔ will appear next to the Control ID for each submission. There is no "submit" button.

Conflict of Interest - click this box if you determine you have a conflict in reviewing the abstract. You will not be able to score the abstract.

Wrong Category – if you feel an abstract has been placed in the wrong category, please check the box and indicate in the comments section which category it should go in. You will not be able to score the abstract.

Newsworthy - Indicate abstracts that might be newsworthy and should be directed to the media by clicking on the "newsworthy" button. Please add comments about the newsworthy aspect in the comments section (along with any other comments you might have).

If you have an abstract in which the scientific content is difficult to determine because of a potential formatting or coding problem, please contact the PAS Program Office (info@PASmeeting.org) or Scholar One Technical Support (ts.acsupport@clarivate.com).

Review and Scoring Guidelines

The content of all abstracts is to be kept confidential and authors should not be contacted.

Scores and comments will be compiled, averaged, and transmitted to the PAS Program Committee Coordinating Chair(s). The PAS Program Committee will meet to finalize abstract programs on February 10.

Grading Scale
Grade all abstracts by assigning a score from 1 (best) to 7 (worst). 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 best abstracts present data or tell a story that is new, true, and important, and ***have a high-quality research design with methods and analysis that match the type of study.***

1. Best abstracts in category/topic area
2. Excellent → outstanding
3. Very good → excellent
4. Good – solid
5. Acceptable
6. Borderline acceptable
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.
Rating 5:   Might still merit presentation as a poster if it adds to the existing literature on the topic.
Ratings 6 -7:   Imply that an abstract should not be presented.

Criteria to be Considered for Scoring
We encourage you to be rigorous and consistent in how you score abstracts. We want researchers who submit abstracts to know that the rating of their work has been fair and just.

You should consider the following characteristics in deciding your score for an abstract.

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?

Importance
- Does the abstract address an important problem?
- Will scientific knowledge be advanced by the results of this abstract?

- 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?
- Is this a topic that conference attendees are particularly interested in learning or hearing about?

Quality of research design methods, 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?
- Do the results reflect the design, methods and analysis?

Background and Objectives
- Is the rationale for the study appropriately justified?
- Is the study question clearly stated in the Objectives section?

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? Do precision and formatting of numerical data meet recommended guidelines?
- Are vague words avoided in discussing results?

How to Weigh These Considerations in Your Score

Detailed suggestions for weighing these considerations and coming up with a score for each abstract are given in the reference "A Practical Guide to Writing and Reviewing Abstracts for Pediatric Academic Meetings" (link listed above and attached below as a pdf).

In general, your assessment of the quality of the research design, methods, and analysis should receive the most weight in determining your score. Despite the importance of a topic, if the design is inadequate, you should score the abstract as borderline or unacceptable.

Your assessment of the importance of the topic should be considered next in weight as you score an abstract. On occasion, the importance of the topic (or the high interest it holds for the audience) may be considered so great as to outweigh _some_ problems with the research design or analysis as you score the abstract.

Submission Violations

Notify the PAS Program Office at info@PASmeeting.org or by phone 346.980.9717 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.

Staff Contact and Technical Support

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact:

PAS Program Office
Email: info@pasmeeting.org
Phone: 346.980.9717

For technical support using the grader site please contact:
Scholar One Technical Support
Phone: 434.964.4100 or 888.503.1050; M - F: 12 am - 8:30 pm (EST)
Email: ts.acsupport@clarivate.com