

**2016 AAPM Annual Meeting  
ABSTRACT REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS**

Thank you for serving as a reviewer for abstracts for the AAPM Annual Meeting! The success of the meeting depends on the quality of the review process. While authors bear responsibility for clear, accurate presentation of their work, reviewers bring significant effort and expertise to judging the quality of the work. If you have any questions, please contact the appropriate Program Director or AAPM Programs Manager. See Contact Information below.

**\*\*\*DEADLINE: All scores must be submitted by 5:00pm (EST) Thursday, March 24\*\*\***

**Kindly take this deadline into consideration when reviewing, as the deadline cannot be extended**

**1. SCORING THE ABSTRACTS**

**Scores:** Score each abstract on a scale of **1 to 10**. (1 = worst, 10 = best) according to the **Criteria** in the Table below.

CRITERIA	SCIENTIFIC	PROFESSIONAL	EDUCATIONAL	SCORE	Rubric	Possible Assignment 
	Clarity			10	Outstanding	
	Quality of Supporting Data			9	Excellent	
	Scientific Rigor	Accuracy	Educational Innovation	8	Excellent	
	Innovation	Timeliness	Innovation already Implemented	7	Good	
	Potential Significance	Professional Significance	Completed Assessment of Changes	6	Good	
	Interest (to Researchers)	Interest to the Professional practice of medical physics	Assessment Results Described	5	Fair	
		Potential for Broad Dissemination and Implementation	4	Fair		
			3	Poor		
			2	Very Poor		
			1	Unacceptable		

**Spread your scores:** Use the full score range (1-10) with mean ~5-6, recognizing both the **Rubrics** and very approximate range of possible assignments above [Oral (≥7), Short Oral (≥6), Poster (≥3)]. **Provide comments** to help break ties.

**Reviewing Support Documents:** Some Support Documents may exceed 1 page, such as Young Investigator, Junior Investigator, and Science Council Session submissions. Please do not penalize these submissions for exceeding 1 page.

**Provide Comments:** **Including comments is strongly recommended as they are taken into account during abstract assignment.**

**Checkboxes:** Please use the checkboxes on the scoring page to identify:

- NEWSWORTHY / GROUNDBREAKING.** (Abstract will be considered for inclusion in a press release.)
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST – PLEASE REASSIGN.** (Abstract will be reassigned.) Although the review process is double-blind, you may be able to discern abstracts from your institution or collaborators. If so, please check this box.
- I AM UNQUALIFIED TO REVIEW THIS ABSTRACT.** (Abstract will be reassigned.)
- NOTE: THIS ABSTRACT APPEARS TO BE IN THE WRONG SUBMISSION CATEGORY.** This checkbox is for informational purposes only. Checking this box will not result in reassignment of the abstract, and you are asked to review the abstract anyway – unless you have selected the previous checkbox (UNQUALIFIED).

**2. THE REVIEW WEBSITE**

**Logging in:** The reviewer website is available at: <http://amos3.aapm.org/login.php?mid=115>

Log in using your AMOS username and password. Once you are logged in, select the **'REVIEWER'** link under **'ROLES'** to reach your Reviewer Homepage. You will see links to assignments and scoring tools. Download the individual or combined PDFs. Assign scores and comments as described above. Finalize by clicking the **SUBMIT** link.

You may login as many times as you like, **BUT once you finalize scores, you are not allowed back into the system.**

**3. CONFIDENTIALITY**

**Anonymity:** This is a blind review, and authors are assured confidentiality. If authors have followed instructions, you will not see author information. It is up to reviewers to maintain confidentiality and not disclose the contents of abstracts.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

For questions regarding scientific content or abstract scoring, please contact the appropriate [Track Director](#):  
For questions related to the website or other administration, please contact:

Contact:	Role:	E-mail Address
Laurie Allen	Programs Manager	<a href="mailto:laurie@aapm.org">laurie@aapm.org</a>