

Abstract Review

Author: _____

Scoring

(1 = Superb; 2 = Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 4 = Weak; 5 = Terrible)

- 1) Is there a clear focus, purpose, model, theory or philosophy upon which the paper is based? _____
- 2) Does the paper give promise of providing new insights to the history of ophthalmology and/or vision science? _____
- 3) Does the research appear to be based on appropriate primary and secondary source materials? _____
- 4) Is the abstract written in a careful, logical and interesting manner that promises a paper that is likely to be both sound and appealing? _____
- 5) Is the methodology, procedure, design or organization of the paper appropriate to the topic? _____
- 6) Do the syntheses of ideas, data analyses or findings appear to be appropriate and complete relative to the topic? _____
- 7) Do the conclusions contribute insights into the history of ophthalmology and/or vision science? _____
- 8) Does the presentation promise to be of general interest to Cogan members? _____

TOTAL _____

Recommendations:

1. Accept presentation as is _____
2. Revise & resubmit
a) Basically acceptable but needs minor improvements* _____
b) Needs major revision or reframing to be acceptable (re-review required)* _____
3. Reject outright* _____

Time:

Is time segment reasonable? (Y or N) _____
Recommended time* _____

IMPORTANT For all * responses, please send on a separate page:

- 1) Brief comments/recommendations for transmission to the author that explain/justify your decision
- 2) Any confidential comments (so labeled) for me