

American Academy of Forensic Sciences – Physical Anthropology Section Annual Meeting Abstract Review Process

1. Review Committee

- a. The Review Committee will consist of the Physical Anthropology Program Committee Chair and co-Chair, and five other advisory reviewers from the Physical Anthropology Section.
- b. The advisory reviewers will be selected by the Physical Anthropology Program Committee Chair and co-Chair, with the Program Chair having final authority over the selection process. Advisory reviewers should represent a broad-based academic/research and/or practitioner perspective. Advisory reviewers should also be Members or Fellows of the Physical Anthropology Section.
- c. The Review Committee will sign the Program Committee Disclosure Form and return the form to the American Academy of Forensic Sciences.

2. Initial Review

- a. The submitted abstracts will be evenly divided amongst the Review Committee by the Chair and co-Chair with emphasis placed on awareness of potential conflicts of interest.
- b. The following guidelines will be followed when distributing abstracts:
 - i. A reviewer cannot review his/her own paper.
 - ii. A reviewer cannot review his/her student's paper.
 - iii. A reviewer cannot review a paper from his/her agency, organization, or academic institution.
 - iv. Reviewers cannot review papers that they have had previous involvement as either a grant reviewer or consultant on the project, or other similar capacity.
- c. Each member of the Review Committee will make a recommendation to accept or reject an abstract based on the following criteria:
 - i. Did the applicant follow the AAFS submission criteria?
 - ii. Is the abstract/subject relevant to the discipline?
 1. If not, identify the most appropriate section, and the Program Chair will discuss transfer to a different section with the applicant.
 - iii. Is there a clearly demonstrated command of all previous relevant work?
 1. If relevant references are included, an abstract should contain a Cited References section.
 - iv. Is the study design clearly articulated?
 - v. Is the study design valid?
 - vi. Are results presented?
 1. Are they valid?
 2. Do they support the conclusions?
 - vii. Quality of writing (i.e. typographical errors, proper grammar).
 - viii. Is the abstract/subject relevant to the program/meeting theme?
 - ix. Has the lead author submitted more than one paper to the section?
 1. The intent is to develop a diverse program with no individual dominating the agenda. Multiple high-quality papers from a single author should be accepted, particularly if they highlight different avenues of research; however, authors with multiple submissions may be requested to distill and combine presentations to minimize repetition.
 - x. Is the abstract written with the appropriate audience in mind (e.g. over simplistic or general statements should be avoided)?

- d. A numerical scoring system will be used to rank-order submissions. Rank-ordering allows the Physical Anthropology Committee Program Chair and co-Chair to fill available podium and poster slots from highest to lowest score.
 - i. A positive answer to each question in 2.c receives a point (i.e. value of 1).
 - ii. The points are totaled for the abstract score.
 - iii. The information and any additional comments are recorded on the attached form.

3. Accept/Reject

- a. The Physical Anthropology Committee Program Chair and co-Chair will determine whether to accept or reject an abstract based on an independent review of the abstracts by the Program Chair and co-Chair, and the recommendations made by the advisory reviewers on the Review Committee. One of the following decisions will result:
 - i. Accept without modification
 - ii. Accept with revision
 - iii. Change from podium to poster or poster to podium
 - iv. Recommend submission to a different Section.
 - v. Reject

4. Communication of Decision to Review Committee

- a. The Program Chair will communicate the decisions to the Review Committee and will organize a meeting/web-conference to:
 - i. Collectively review the abstracts and discuss issues associated with specific papers.
 - ii. Discuss actions taken by the Program Chair that are contrary to a recommendation made by an advisory reviewer.
 - iii. Develop the program schedule and identify potential moderators.

5. Schedule

- a. The schedule outline will be communicated to the AAFS by the Program Chair within the time-frame required by the AAFS.

6. Communication of Decision to Authors

- a. The Program Chair will communicate with authors that have submitted abstracts that are:
 - i. Accepted, but require revision
 - ii. Changed from podium to poster or poster to podium.
 - iii. Proposed for a section switch.
 - iv. Combine presentations if lead author has submitted multiple papers to section.
- b. The AAFS will communicate with authors that have submitted abstracts that are:
 - i. Accepted without modification.
 - ii. Rejected.

7. Dissenting Opinion

- a. There is no formal appeals process, given the limited time available to finalize the program. However, the Program Chair and submitting authors are encouraged to discuss the decision-making process and determine if there is an alternative to rejection of the submitted abstract.
- b. Authors may submit a dissenting opinion that will be retained by the Section's Program Chair/Executive Committee for a period of one year.

SCORING RUBRIC FOR ANTHROPOLOGY ABSTRACTS

Thank you for agreeing to review the Anthropology abstracts. Please use this rubric when evaluating each abstract. When you have completed your review, put the score in the comments box with a "YES," "NO," or "MAYBE," and an explanation why. **DO NOT** check the "no" box on the abstract page.

Do you have a conflict of interest with the author(s) and/or their institution(s) for this abstract?

YES

NO

- 1) Learning objective: Does the abstract provide a novel or important contribution to the field in practice, research, theory, or knowledge?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)
- 2) Introduction: Do(es) the author(s) provide(s) relevant justification for the study/ presentation?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)
- 3) Methods: a) Are the methods/discussion points clear regardless of research paper, case study, technical note, or theoretical paper?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

b) Are the methods/theoretical foundations properly implemented/described, e.g. adequate sample size, appropriate analytical methods, comprehensive description.
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt).
- 4) Results: a) Are results (quantitative or qualitative) presented?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

b) Are the results (quantitative or qualitative) complete (e.g. the results address all the learning objectives, stated hypotheses, or quantitative/qualitative research questions)?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)
- 5) AAFS Requirements: Does the abstract meet the AAFS requirements for abstracts (length, major editing, etc.)? AAFS abstract length is a "minimum" of 400 words and a "maximum" is 700. If it is over or under that, note it in your comments. References do not count in the word count, but learning objectives and impact statement do. If the abstract does not meet the length requirements, if more than 10 corrections are needed to make the abstract intelligible in English, or if it so poorly worded that you don't know what they are talking about, 0 points should be awarded for this criterion. Please note this in the comment field as well. Style does not count for edits, nor do "happy to glad" corrections. The AAFS staff will do some corrections, but the Program Chair and Co-Chair are responsible for the rest.
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

