

Abstract Review Scoring Matrix

Template 1: General academic conference

☐ In scope ☐ Submission complete ☐ Conflict disclosed or recused ☐ Ethics concern flagged if applicable

Criterion	Score 1-5 or N/A	Reviewer rationale
Methodological soundness		
Originality and contribution		
Relevance to conference or track		
Clarity and completeness		
Potential significance or impact		

Composite average

Overall recommendation

☐ Accept

☐ Borderline

☐ Do not accept

Reviewer confidence (separate from the composite)

Required comment for low, high or borderline scores

Anchors: 1 = major concerns; 2 = substantial concerns; 3 = adequate; 4 = strong; 5 = exceptional. Exclude N/A criteria from the average and explain why. Reviewer confidence informs assignment or escalation; it is not part of the quality score.

Weighted Abstract Review Matrix

Template 2: Sample weights for a multi-track academic conference

Confirm the criteria and weights before review begins. If a criterion is not applicable, redistribute its weight before reviewers score submissions.

Criterion	Weight	Score 1-5	Weighted score	Reviewer rationale
Methodological soundness	30%			
Originality and contribution	25%			
Relevance to conference or track	20%			
Clarity and completeness	15%			
Potential significance or impact	10%			

Weighted composite (sum of weight x score)

Reviewer confidence (not weighted)

Overall recommendation

☐

Accept

☐

Borderline

☐

Do not accept

Formula: weighted score = criterion weight x score. With weights totaling 100%, the composite remains on the 1-5 scale. Round only the final composite, normally to two decimal places.

Medical and Clinical Abstract Review Matrix

Template 3: Research abstracts for health and clinical conferences

☐ Study type identified ☐ Ethics and consent reported if applicable ☐ Registration reported if applicable ☐ Conflict disclosed

Criterion	Score 1-5 or N/A	Reviewer rationale
Research question and importance		
Study design is appropriate for the question		
Methods and analysis are sufficiently described		
Results are clear and complete		
Conclusions are supported by the results		
Clinical or public-health relevance		

Composite average

Reviewer confidence

Ethics, safety or reporting concern

☐ Yes

☐ No

Overall recommendation

☐ Accept

☐ Borderline

☐ Do not accept

Judge whether the design fits the question; do not award points solely for a preferred study type. Do not penalize negative or inconclusive results. Apply the reporting checklist appropriate to the study design.

Computer Science Abstract Review Matrix

Template 4: Computing, engineering and technical conference tracks

☐ In track scope ☐ Conflict disclosed or recused ☐ Anonymity policy followed ☐ Ethics or dual-use concern flagged

Criterion	Score 1-5 or N/A	Reviewer rationale
Technical soundness and correctness		
Novelty and originality of contribution		
Significance and likely value to the field		
Clarity and completeness		
Reproducibility and transparency		
Relevance to the conference or track		

Composite average

Reviewer confidence

Artifact or evidence available

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not expected

Overall recommendation

☐ Accept

☐ Borderline

☐ Do not accept

Score only what the call for abstracts requests. Treat artifact availability as a separate signal when it is optional. Record safety, privacy, security or dual-use concerns for chair review rather than hiding them inside the composite score.