ABSTRACT SELECTION

1. Overview

1. The ESCAIDE conference is held over 3 days in a venue with limited capacity. Hence both conference space and programme time dictates that only a certain number of abstracts can be presented at the Conference. Therefore a selection has to be made to meet conference capacity limits.

2. Selection also ensures that the Conference retains a threshold for scientific quality; only abstracts that are of a certain standard are accepted in the Conference programme. Submitted abstracts to ESCAIDE form the backbone of the Conference. Over 90% of the ESCAIDE scientific programme content comprises of the presentation of submitted abstracts following an open call. Hence the quality of these abstracts determines the quality of the Conference. Therefore, it is of utmost importance that all submitted abstracts are subject to independent peer review. To make the review and selection process transparent and consistent and account for differences between reviewers, the selection algorithm is outlined below. The aim of this process is to ensure that:

   • Authors can have confidence that the process of selection is fair;
   • Abstract reviewers understand that their assessment of each abstract is vital. Reviewer opinion and scoring underpins abstract selection and therefore directly impacts on the content of the Conference programme.
   • Conference delegates can have confidence that the ESCAIDE programme is developed independently, in quality-driven processes.

3. Ultimately the Scientific Committee must ensure that abstract review and selection are based on quality, transparency and equitability, and the processes and criteria used to select abstracts enhance the scientific quality of the conference. In practical terms, the Committee:

   • Sets the thresholds for acceptance of abstracts based on the overall quality and range of topics of abstracts;
   • Ensures that the selection process and algorithm is applied accurately and consistently to support fair selection; and
   • Acts as an arbiter and take on the role of an additional review panel in cases, where the abstract selection algorithm proves insufficient. This includes divergence of reviewers' decisions and scores on a specific abstract (within-reviewer variance), divergence of scores between different reviewers which results in 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.

2. Selection process

1. The selection process is based on an identification of 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 venue capacity and programme start and end times. Historically 200-300 abstracts have been accepted into the conference each year from over 400 abstracts submitted following the open call.

The following 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: All author requests for a poster presentation are respected. Hence 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 conference capacity, and is typically based on the acceptance of ca. 230 abstracts, of which approximately 80 are oral presentations. It is applied by using the mean reviewer scores awarded to each abstract- these 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.

Illustrative example based on a threshold for oral presentations is 16 and above ('Abstract inclusion threshold' based on space and time limitation) and for posters is 13 and above.

Abstract number	Author preference	Reviewer Preference and Scores (O=Oral, P=Poster, R=Reject)					Final Decision	Comment
		1	2	3	Mean	Majority Consensus		
Abstract A	Oral	(O)20	(P)15	(O)16	**17**	Oral	Oral	Review consensus = Oral (Decision 1)
Abstract B	Oral	(P)14	(O)16	(O)15	**15**	Oral	Poster	Review consensus =Oral. However the score is below inclusion threshold for orals = Poster (Decision 1&4)
Abstract C	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. (Decision 2)
Abstract D	Oral	(O)19	(P)19	(R)13	**17**	*None*	*(Oral)*	No consensus, but 2/3 reviewers (majority) indicate acceptance. Preliminary decision based on scores, pending final review by the Scientific Committee. (Decision 3 & 4)

Abstract E	Oral	(P)19	(P)19	(O)16	**18**	Oral	Poster	Review consensus = Poster, so even though score is above capacity threshold, the abstract is allocated to posters. (Decision 1)
Abstract F	Oral	(O)17	(R)13	(P)15	**15**	*None*	(Poster)	**See Example D:** Preliminary decision (based on score), pending review and final decision by the Scientific Committee. (Decision 3 & 4)
Abstract G	Oral	(R)16	(P)14	(R)12	**14**	Reject	Reject	Review consensus to reject= Reject (Decision 1)

2. 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 complete, the final allocation decisions for the abstracts are collated, and each abstract author is informed of the final decision by e-mail.