

Legend:

Blue = Relevant to both Scientific Abstracts and Education / Workshop Sessions

White = Specific to Scientific Abstracts only

Gray = Specific to Education / Workshop Sessions only

Note: Scientific Abstracts are judged separately from Education/Workshop Proposals.

Abstracts, out of 36 points

Workshops, out of 30 points

	Outstanding (5)	Very Strong (4)	Good (3)	Adequate (2)	Poor (1)	N/A (0)
<p>Introduction and Objective of the Scientific Abstract Or Education / Workshop Purpose</p> <p>Does the abstract provide an adequate overview of the problem or knowledge gap with clear objectives?</p>						
	<p>The introduction provides a strong, clear, and in-depth overview of the research problem or workshop/education proposal, while remaining concise.</p> <p>The proposed project addresses the identified knowledge gap, OR a clear testable research objective is stated.</p>	<p>The introduction provides a clear and fairly detailed overview of the research problem or workshop/education proposal.</p> <p>The knowledge gap or a clear and testable research objective or workshop/education proposal objective is stated.</p>	<p>The introduction provides a superficial overview of the issue.</p> <p>The proposed project appears to align with the proposed research objective or workshop/education proposal objective.</p>	<p>The introduction provides a context that is not informed by objectives.</p> <p>A clear but non-testable research objective or workshop/education proposal objective is stated.</p>	<p>The introduction provides a context that is not informed by objectives.</p> <p>A vague and non-testable research objective or workshop/education proposal objective is stated.</p>	

Methods of the Scientific Abstract

Or

Education / Workshop Approach of Presentation

Is the study methodology or pedagogical approach clear, appropriate, or bridge translation into practice?

Scientific Abstract	The description provides a solid and clear explanation of the methods used, including (if relevant) design, population, variables and measurement instruments, data collection data analysis method, and, if applicable, the method for selecting articles. There is a strong emphasis on statistics including reliability if relevant.	The description of the methods used is clear. Some clarification could be required.	The description provided allows us to understand the overall method used, but substantial clarification is necessary.	The description provided is adequate but disorganized with gaps that compromise its overall understanding.	The description is incomprehensible and does not allow for a clear understanding of the methods used.	
Education / Workshop	<p>The approach seamlessly incorporates fascia science into an innovative and captivating didactic approach.</p> <p>The approach is logically sound, highly relevant, and expertly bridges the gap between theory and clinical or research practice. The approach provides actionable insights and practical tools for immediate application.</p>	<p>The approach effectively integrates fascia science with a creative and engaging didactic approach.</p> <p>The approach is logically structured, highly relevant to clinicians and researchers, and demonstrates clear translation into practice.</p>	<p>The approach demonstrates a logical connection to fascia science and relevance to practice.</p> <p>The didactic approach is clear and somewhat engaging, with room for more creativity.</p> <p>The translation of knowledge into clinical or research applications is evident but not fully developed.</p>	<p>The didactic methods are conventional and lack creativity.</p> <p>There is limited focus on translating knowledge into clinical or research practice.</p>	<p>The approach lacks a clear connection to fascia science.</p> <p>The didactic approach is unclear, overly basic, or not engaging.</p>	

Results or Expected Results of the Scientific Abstract
(Not scored for Education / Workshop)
 Are the results clear and address the stated objective?

	<p>The results are clear and directly related to the objective of the study. They fully address the research problem and/or hypothesis.</p> <p>Results are presented logically.</p> <p>The results follow the methods precisely, supporting the methodology and clearly showing how the data was obtained.</p>	<p>The results are clear and mostly related to the study's objective. They address the research problem/hypothesis.</p> <p>Results are presented reasonably.</p> <p>The results generally follow the methods and show how the data was obtained, with minor inconsistencies.</p>	<p>The results are somewhat clear but only partially address the study's objective and research problem/hypothesis.</p> <p>Results are presented with some logical structure.</p> <p>The results are aligned with the methods but may contain inconsistencies or gaps that hinder understanding.</p>	<p>The results are unclear or vaguely related to the objective of the study and only weakly address the research problem.</p> <p>Presentation of results is disorganized.</p> <p>The results loosely follow the methods, but the connection between the data and methodology is unclear.</p>	<p>The results are unclear and unrelated to the study's objective. They fail to address the research problem/hypothesis.</p> <p>The presentation of results is disorganized and lacks clarity.</p> <p>The results do not follow the methods or provide insufficient detail about how the data was obtained.</p>	Select this for Education/Workshop proposals.
--	---	---	---	---	--	---

Discussion and Conclusion of the Scientific Abstract
Or
Education / Workshop Abstracts Content AND Scientific & Clinical Significance
 Are the conclusions or didactic content supported by the study results or by fascia science?

Scientific Abstract	<p>The discussion presents a clear interpretation of the results and the importance of the work in a well-structured and logical argument.</p> <p>The conclusion is fully supported by the study's results.</p> <p>The conclusion is related to the wider literature or wider context.</p>	<p>The discussion presents a reasonable interpretation of the results and the importance of the work in a well-structured argument.</p> <p>The conclusion is primarily supported by the study's results.</p>	<p>The discussion presents the justification and importance of the work in a structured argument.</p> <p>The conclusion is partially supported by the study's results.</p>	<p>The discussion weakly presents the justification and importance of the work in a structured argument.</p> <p>The conclusion is weakly supported by the study's results.</p>	<p>The discussion shows some effort to present the justification and importance of the work but lacks structure.</p> <p>The conclusion is not supported by the study's results.</p>	
---------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

Education / Workshop	The approach is deeply rooted in fascia science, citing strong, current evidence. The comprehensive rationale demonstrates a clear understanding of fascia science and its application to the methodology.	The approach is well-grounded in fascia science literature. The clear and logical rationale is supported with multiple up-to-date references.	The approach is somewhat supported by fascia science literature. The rationale is explained but could benefit from stronger connections to evidence.	The rationale for the approach is loosely connected to fascia science but lacks depth. There are few or outdated references provided.	There are no references to fascia science or rationale for the approach. The approach lacks clarity or coherence.	
----------------------	---	--	---	--	--	--

Clarity

Are the language and structure clear and allow understanding by the broader fascia community?

<p>The abstract is exceptionally clear and well-organized, with a structure that supports the presentation and interpretation of the results.</p> <p>The abstract is concise and focuses on the essential points, with FRS guidelines scrupulously followed.</p> <p>The abstract is communicated in an accessible and relevant language to a broader audience and wider fascia community.</p>	<p>Clarity and organization are evident throughout the abstract, facilitating readability and understanding of the results.</p> <p>The abstract is concise and closely follows the FRS guidelines, with minimal deviations.</p> <p>The abstract is somewhat communicated in a somewhat accessible and relevant language to a broader audience and wider fascia community.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally clear and well-organized, with a logical structure that facilitates understanding and interpretation of the results.</p> <p>The abstract is concise with significant deviations from the FRS guidelines.</p> <p>The abstract is partially communicated in an accessible manner and relevant language or attempts are made to a broader audience and wider fascia community.</p>	<p>Some clarity and organization are present, but the abstract is mostly disorganized or lack coherence.</p> <p>The abstract does not follow the FRS guidelines</p>	<p>The abstract completely lacks clarity and organization.</p> <p>The abstract is poorly structured and difficult to follow, with complete deviations from the FRS guidelines.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Originality						
How original is the work and how does it add to the existing fascia knowledge?						
	The work is exceptionally original , while maintaining a scientific rigor: the theories/methods have not been reported in prior literature or the approach of the study/education/workshop session is completely new.	The work is somewhat original : the idea/method is already reported in the literature (or partially) but the way the method is applied or the topic of study/education/workshop session on which the idea is used are new.	The work highlights some new points , useful for the scientific and clinical community, although the methods/theory are not new.	Most of the theory/methods have already been reported in the prior literature. The work adds some new small or minor points .	All the theories/methods have already been reported, the work lacks originality , is confusing and unclear.	
Interest for the Community						
How relevant is this to the fascia community?						
	The project shows exceptional impact on the community, with elements having significant and direct effects. The topic enriches knowledge on fascia, presents innovation, or opens new avenues for future research.	The project demonstrates strong interest for the community, with concrete contributions directly impacting the field. The topic is relevant to fascia, with encouraging aspects.	The project demonstrates moderate interest , with potential benefits for the community. The topic is related to fascia but has room for improvement in impact and scope that could be further developed.	Elements of interest for the community are present but limited in scope or relevance. The topic contributes to fascia, but its scope and relevance are limited.	The project shows minimal interest, with limited and insignificant attempts to integrate relevant elements. The topic provides minimal new insights into fascia, with no relevance to the community.	
Total Score						