Abstract review system

Each abstract will be scored independently across **six criteria**, with clearly defined anchors from **0 to 4** (or 0 to 1 for conclusions). The system is flexible enough to apply to different types of research, including quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods approaches.

1. Innovation (0–4)

Definition: Evaluates the originality, novelty, or creative approach in the ideas, methods, analysis, or interpretation.

Score	Description
0	Entirely routine, no new insights or approaches. Replicates existing work with no added value.
1	Minor adaptation or small variation on existing work; lacks clear novelty.
2	Some innovative elements, but either not well developed or not clearly presented.
3	Innovative within its context; clear attempt at novel methods, questions, or interpretation.
4	Highly innovative; could shift paradigms or substantially change understanding, policy, or practice.

2. Significance (0–4)

Definition: Assesses the potential impact of the research on science, policy, practice, or future research.

Score	Description
0	No discernible significance; irrelevant or trivial to the field.
1	Limited relevance or importance; contributes little to current knowledge or debate.
2	Moderate significance; contributes to understanding but unlikely to change policy or practice.

3	Clear importance: results are impactful within the field and may influence future work.
4	High impact; likely to influence research agendas, policy, or practice significantly.

3. Design Consideration (0–4)

Definition: Evaluates the quality, appropriateness, and rigour of the study design for the stated objectives.

Score	Description
0	Inappropriate or unclear design; critical flaws.
1	Basic design in place but with important limitations (e.g., bias, confounding not addressed).
2	Adequate design with moderate rigour; some limitations that weaken validity.
3	Appropriate, rigorous design for the type of study (e.g., randomisation, robust sampling, participatory approaches, saturation).
4	Strong rigour **above and beyond** expectations for study type (e.g., multi-method triangulation, extensive stakeholder input, robust quality control).

4. Method Description (0–4)

Definition: Assesses the clarity and sufficiency of the methods section.

Score	Description
0	No methods described.
1	Very limited method description: unclear how work was conducted.
2	Some relevant details provided, but insufficient to assess rigour or reproducibility.
3	Clear and sufficient method description; allows assessment of validity.

| 4 | Exceptionally clear and comprehensive methods, including rationale, limitations, and ethical considerations. |

5. Results (0–4)

Definition: Assesses whether the results are clearly presented and sufficiently detailed.

Score	Description
0	No results presented.
1	Results are unclear, minimal, or confusing.
2	Some results presented but lack clarity or comprehensiveness.
3	Clear and sufficient results; logically linked to methods and objectives.
4	Highly detailed and well-presented results; tables/figures (if included) enhance clarity.

6. Conclusion (0–1)

Definition: Evaluates whether the conclusions are clearly stated and supported by the data.

Score	Description
0	Conclusions are unclear, overstate findings, or are not supported by results.
1	Conclusions are appropriate, clearly stated, and supported by the presented evidence.

Maximum score: 21