

Guidelines for Scientific Review of Congress Papers

Please direct all enquiries and feedback to the Congress Organizing Office at ifssh-ifsht@intercongress.de. It will be forwarded to the Chair of the Scientific Programme Committee, Prof. Dr. Max Haerle.

Introduction: Overview

This document is intended to provide information, guidance and support to members of the Abstract Review Committee. The guide will describe the rationale, process and outcomes of the abstract review process, and provide examples of rated abstracts.

Outcomes of review process

The aim of the review process is to develop a scientific programme that:

- Is of high quality and excites congress attendees
- Reflects innovation and diversity of hand surgery research, practice, professional issues and education
- Reflects a balance between research, practice, professional issues and education
- Reflects a balance between the varied practice areas of the hand surgery profession

Congress papers are not necessarily research papers that have been submitted for publication in a journal, but rather should be seen more as a review paper in which personal views are acceptable if supported by evidence.

Please note that the Congress Organizers encourage first-time presenters. Perfect English is not essential but meaning needs to be clear and the paper should be well structured and logically argued. Scoring criteria will ensure that quality of writing is scored separate to the educational value of the abstract.

These guidelines have been based on the Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists' Scientific Program Committee Abstract Review Guide and are used with permission.

Abstract submission and reviewing process

1. Submitting author nominate the type of presentation:
 - i) Only oral presentation (traditional podium presentation)
 - ii) Only e-poster presentation (e-poster session on computer based terminals)
 - iii) Oral presentation or poster presentation (if the abstract is not selected for oral presentation it can be reviewed for poster presentation)
2. Submitting authors select a topic:
Arthroscopy, Assessment in Upper Extremity, Avascular Necrosis, Burns, Congenital and Pediatric Trauma, Diagnostic Value, Dupuytren, Elbow and Forearm, Experimental, Fractures and Dislocations Hand, Humanitarian Aid, Infection, Innovation, Nerve – Thoracic-Outlet-Syndrom, Nerve – Transfer, Osteoarthritis, Rheumatoid, Scar and Aesthetics, Soft Tissue Reconstruction and Microsurgery, Tendon, Tetraplegic and Spastic, Tumor, Wrist – Carpus, Wrist – Radius, Miscellaneous
3. Submitting authors enter their abstracts in following structure:
 - iv) Title
 - v) Objectives / Interrogation
 - vi) Methods
 - vii) Results and conclusions
4. Each submitted abstract is matched anonymously to the reviewers based on self-declared knowledge of reviewers.
5. Abstracts are reviewed using the online reviewing tool which is based on the Abstract Review Rating Form (see attached).
6. Completed reviews are submitted to the Scientific Programme Committee including recommended scoring.
7. Abstracts are assigned a rating of "accepted for oral presentation", "accepted for poster presentation" and "not accepted" by the committee based on overall ranking of the sum of ratings and Reviewer comments.
8. Accepted presentations are assigned a timeslot in the program by the Chair of the Scientific Programme Committee.

Copy of the Abstract Review Scoring System

<p>Quality of the Presentation Content (25 points) Use the following rating system: 1 = unacceptable: information is incomplete or absent 2 = marginal: missing key information or description 3 = acceptable: provides some information but not overly informative 4 = good: provides the majority of key information 5 = exceptional: informative and comprehensive</p>					
<p>There is substantial information that is appropriate to the content. The abstract is formatted using the following headings: Objectives and Interrogation, Methods, Results and Conclusions. For research, results can include projected or preliminary data, if data not yet compiled.</p>					
Content Headings	Unacceptable 1	marginal 2	Acceptable 3	good 4	exceptional 5
a) Objectives					
b) Interrogation					
c) Methods					
d) Results					
e) Conclusions					

<p>Educational Value (15 points) Use the following rating system: 1 = low; unacceptable; comprehension difficulty 2 ⇕ 3 = moderate; acceptable 4 ⇕ 5 = high; exceptional</p>					
Content Headings	low 1	2	moderate 3	4	high 5
2. Interest and appeal to a hand surgery audience (e.g., needs to be heard, important or common issue, new thinking)					
3. Important contribution to practice, research, theory or knowledge					
4. Novel or innovative contribution (e.g., current trends or new ideas)					

<p>Quality of Written Abstract (10 points) Use the following rating system: 1 = low; unacceptable; comprehension difficulty 2 ⇕ 3 = moderate; acceptable 4 ⇕ 5 = high; exceptional</p>					
Content Headings	low 1	2	moderate 3	4	high 5
5. Self-contained (i.e., should not include abbreviations, acronyms, quotes or extensive reference citations) and concise /specific (i.e., each sentence is maximally informative, especially the lead sentence)					
6. Coherent and readable (i.e., written in logical sequence, use of clear vigorous prose, use of the active not passive voice)					