

Abstract Review Guidelines and Best Practices

Purpose: Provide guidelines and best practices for abstract review processes for TCs., representing minimum requirements that need to be met in the evaluation of abstracts for acceptance into AIAA Forums. Each TC can adapt the guidelines.

End Goal: Contribute to Forum technical quality improvement and reduce late paper withdrawals.

Context: Guidelines considered the use of the ScholarOne reviewer module.

1. General Considerations for Abstract Review

The following aspects should be met in reviewing abstracts:

1. Review all 5 scoring elements in Section 2 to inform accept/reject recommendation.
2. Provide comments in a professional manner in the ScholarOne reviewer module box as they constitute valuable data in resolving discrepancies in evaluations amongst reviewers.
3. Contact TDC so that a substitute reviewer be arranged if a conflict of interest arises.
4. Do not share contents of the abstracts as they are confidential.

2. Specific Guidelines for Abstract Review

For each category, use your best judgement to rank abstracts as *excellent*, *above average*, *average*, *below average*, or *poor*, based on whether the criteria listed are met or not. Refer to the following guideline when applying judgement:

Criteria	Assessment
Virtually all criteria met	Excellent
Most criteria met	Above Average
Some criteria met	Average
Few criteria met	Below Average
Virtually no criteria met	Poor

Criteria for Technical Quality

- Abstract advances technical knowledge and/or demonstrates outstanding problem solving in the aerospace field.
- Appropriate technical depth
- Author demonstrates a strong understanding and appreciation of the subject matter and the prior art.
- Content is accurate and based on sound engineering/scientific principles.
- Contribution is concerned with technical/scientific information, without any commercialization bias.
- Experimental/numerical accuracy issues have been addressed.

Criteria for Importance/Relevance to Field

- Submission addresses subject matter that is important and relevant to the aerospace field and this relevance is clearly framed.
- Potential to achieve archival value.
- Addresses important technical issues.
- Proposed paper has high interest to the AIAA Academic, Industry, and Government communities.

Originality

- Work is original, innovative, or a creative synthesis of prior knowledge.
- Novel or previously unknown discovery/principle/device/process presented.
- Work is a significant advancement over prior work.
- Submission clearly explains its own original contribution.

Conciseness/Style/Clarity

- Submission clearly explains content and scope.
- Abstract clearly presents the main idea(s) and/or hypothesis(es).
- Initial results and conclusions are identified.
- Submission clearly indicates which additional material will be added to the final paper.
- Figures or tables are included and are clear and legible.
- Submission explains any relevant and/or unique terminology/jargon, i.e., a Nomenclature section is included and/or unusual terms are defined in the text.

- Submission presents information in clear and accessible language, consistent voice and appropriate tense, and it is free of obvious mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation, etc.

Potential to Be a Good Paper

- Proposed paper can be completed in time.
- There is suitable maturity of the source technical work or effort.
- Underlying work is complete or nearly complete as opposed to serving as a promissory or place-holder for work to be completed.
- Tables and figures provided support the discussion and further demonstrate the maturity.
- Submission provides at least a sample of references that support the content, approach, and/or reported results.
- Submission has potential to be referenced in the future.