



## Guidelines for abstract selection

### Overview

1. The ESCAIDE programme is mainly based on the presentation of abstracts, and hence the quality of the conference is heavily reliant on the excellence of the abstracts submitted. An independent peer review process of the abstracts submitted allow us to ensure that the Conference retains a threshold for scientific quality.
2. Each review and scoring underpins abstract selection and has a direct impact on the content of the programme. To ensure a fair and transparent abstract review and selection, a well-defined decision process is applied. **Table 1** illustrates the algorithm we use to review each abstract submitted.
3. The Scientific Committee is responsible to ensure that the abstract review and selection processes are based on quality, transparency and equitability. The Committee should assure that the criteria applied to select abstracts enhance the overall scientific quality of the conference. In practical terms, the ESCAIDE Scientific Committee:
  - Set the thresholds for acceptance of abstracts based on the overall quality and range of topics of abstracts;
  - Ensure that the selection process and algorithm are applied accurately and consistently to support fair selection; and
  - Act as an arbiter and take on the role of an additional review panel in cases where the abstract selection algorithm proves insufficient. For example, where there is divergence of reviewers' decisions and scores on a specific abstract (within-reviewer variance); divergence of scores between different reviewers that could result in a biased selection of certain topics/abstracts (between-reviewer variance); incomplete triplet reviews resulting in uncertain scoring and acceptance decision; and where an additional and definitive review is needed.

### Selection process

4. The selection process is based on a predetermined upper limit of abstracts that can be accepted into the Conference programme. This is decided by the Scientific Committee, but is ultimately determined by the Conference capacity. Historically, 200–300 abstracts have been accepted each year as a result of around 400–500 abstracts submitted during the call for abstracts.
5. ESCAIDE reviewers are encouraged to consider in the review process that generally 'Poster' and 'Oral' presentations in ESCAIDE should not reflect differences in scientific merit. Instead, the recommendation that reviewers give for 'Oral' or 'Poster' should depend on the more suitable way of presentation for any given study (e.g. abundant and complex results, long tables, may benefit from a poster). Therefore, recommendations should only be based on suitability of medium for presentation; the 'Poster' category should not be used for studies that the reviewer considers scientifically 'less important'.

6. The following decision process forms the basis of the selection, in priority order:
- **Decision 1:** Reviewer triplet rules by majority (e.g. 2 reviews accepted as oral = accepted as oral, 2 rejections = rejected).
  - **Decision 2:** The author requests for a poster presentation are respected, i.e., an abstract that has been submitted for a poster cannot be allocated to an oral presentation.
  - **Decision 3:** In case of split reviewer acceptance (i.e. 1 oral, 1 poster, 1 reject), 2/3 reviewers accept the abstract into the conference, so scoring will be used to guide selection based on threshold score (see Decision 4 below), with Scientific Committee (SC) providing further review and final selection.
  - **Decision 4:** The 'Abstract inclusion' threshold is determined by the conference programme capacity, and is typically based on the acceptance of ca. 230 abstracts, of which approximately 80 are oral presentations. The 'Abstract inclusion' threshold is applied by using the mean reviewer scores awarded to each abstract. These scores are used to rank all accepted abstracts (those where at least 2 reviewers award a poster or oral presentation). The highest scoring abstracts with a consensus aware decision as 'oral' by triplet review are accepted as oral presentations (ca. 80). The remaining abstracts above the capacity threshold are awarded a poster presentation. All other abstracts are excluded from the conference.
7. The algorithm is applied to each abstract to determine its selection. The Scientific Committee oversee the process to verify all is fair, and provide further review in cases where the algorithm cannot be applied, or where discrepancies or errors in the review process means that a further judgement and final decision are needed. Once the process is completed, the final allocation decisions for the abstracts are collated, and each abstract author is informed of the final decision via e-mail.

**Table 1** Illustrative example based on a threshold for oral presentations of 16 and above ('Abstract inclusion threshold' based on the online conference programme) and for posters is 13 and above.

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>Author preference</b>	<b>Reviewer Preference and Scores (O=Oral, P=Poster, R=Reject)</b>					<b>Majority Consensus</b>	<b>Final Decision</b>	<b>Comment</b>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Mean</b>				
<b>A</b>	Oral	(O)20	(P)15	(O)16	<b>17</b>	Oral	Oral	Review consensus = Oral ( <a href="#">Decision 1</a> )	
<b>B</b>	Oral	(P)14	(O)16	(O)15	<b>15</b>	Oral	Poster	Review consensus =Oral. However the score is below inclusion threshold for orals = Poster ( <a href="#">Decision 1&amp;4</a> )	

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>Author preference</b>	<b>Reviewer Preference and Scores (O=Oral, P=Poster, R=Reject)</b>					<b>Majority Consensus</b>	<b>Final Decision</b>	<b>Comment</b>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Mean</b>				
<b>C</b>	Poster	(O)19	(O)19	(O)16	18	Oral	Poster	Review consensus =Oral, and score is above inclusion threshold. However author preference is for a poster =Poster. <a href="#">(Decision 2)</a>	
<b>D</b>	Oral	(O)19	(P)19	(R)13	<b>17</b>	None	<i>(Oral)</i>	No consensus, but 2/3 reviewers (majority) indicate acceptance. Preliminary decision based on scores, pending final review by the Scientific Committee. <a href="#">(Decision 3 &amp; 4)</a>	
<b>E</b>	Oral	(P)19	(P)19	(O)16	<b>18</b>	Oral	Poster	Review consensus = Poster, so even though score is above capacity threshold, the abstract is allocated to posters. <a href="#">(Decision 1)</a>	
<b>F</b>	Oral	(O)17	(R)13	(P)15	<b>15</b>	None	(Poster)	<b>See Example D:</b> Preliminary decision (based on score), pending review and final decision by the Scientific Committee. <a href="#">(Decision 3 &amp; 4)</a>	
<b>G</b>	Oral	(R)16	(P)14	(R)12	<b>14</b>	Reject	Reject	Review consensus to reject= Reject <a href="#">(Decision 1)</a>	