

**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?   | _____              |
|  | <b>TOTAL</b> _____ |

**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