

<b>Abstract Components</b>	<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
Introduction	Missing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient background to understand the study purpose</li> <li>• Poorly organized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient background provided, but contains only implicit/superficial connections to the literature</li> <li>• Study purpose unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient background that connects to the literature</li> <li>• Clear study purpose</li> </ul>
Methods	Missing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient methods to understand study approach and/or analyses</li> <li>• Poorly organized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient methods provided, but irrelevant/unimportant details included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient and appropriate methods provided</li> <li>• Clearly written</li> </ul>
Results	Missing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results appear preliminary, misinterpreted, or unrelated to the study purpose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results are provided, but are poorly organized or difficult to interpret from a lay perspective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results are clearly laid out and connected to the study purpose</li> <li>• Easy to interpret from a lay perspective</li> </ul>
Conclusion	Missing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions are unclear and do not clearly connect to study purpose or results</li> <li>• Tenuously evaluates contributions to the field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions are moderately supported by the results and somewhat connect to the study purpose</li> <li>• Moderately evaluates contributions to the field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions are well supported and connect to the study purpose</li> <li>• Clearly evaluates contributions to the field</li> </ul>
Scientific Writing Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerous grammatical errors</li> <li>• Typos and/or undefined jargon impede understanding by a lay audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many grammatical errors</li> <li>• Typos and/or jargon present but do not seriously impede understanding by a lay audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some grammatical errors</li> <li>• Few typos and/or unnecessary jargon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few/no grammatical errors</li> <li>• Jargon is appropriately defined</li> </ul>

Adapted from the following sources: [https://www2.siac.stanford.edu/Suli/2011/DOE/Abstract\\_Rubric\\_and\\_Abstract\\_Examples.pdf](https://www2.siac.stanford.edu/Suli/2011/DOE/Abstract_Rubric_and_Abstract_Examples.pdf)  
<https://www.manchester.edu/docs/default-source/academics/rubricforevaluatingabstracts0c7ec5922d02625b9ff6ff0000763cab.pdf>

