AMERICA'S PEDIATRIC DENTISTS
THE BIG AUTHORITY on little teeth®

AAPD Resident Research Award (RRA) and Research Poster Competition Scoring Criteria

Resident Research Award (RRA)

Abstract Review

Evaluation Criteria

1. **Significance**
   Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?
2. **Innovation**
   Does the project challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches, or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions examined?
3. **Approach**
   Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility, and will particularly risky aspects be managed? If the project involves clinical research, are the plans for:
   a. protection of human subjects from research risks, and
   b. sample size appropriate in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?
4. **Results**
   The results must be stated clearly and are appropriate for a completed project.
5. **Conclusions**
   The conclusions are clear and accurately reflect the results.
6. **Application/Impact**
   Application or impact on pediatric dentistry or children's oral health.

Scoring Scale

Score	Description
5 – High	The proposal surpasses the expectations of the criteria.
4	The proposal effectively exceeds the standard expectations of the criteria.
3	The proposal meets the standard expectations of the criteria.
2	The proposal meets the minimal expectations of the criteria.
1 – Low	The proposal does not meet the criteria.

Manuscript Review

Evaluation Criteria

1. **Manuscript Abstract**
   Does the abstract follow the structured abstract format (purpose, methods, results, and conclusion)? Does the manuscript abstract match the original abstract that was submitted, or has the content drastically changed?
2. **Introduction/Review of Literature**
   Does the introduction describe the purpose, aim, or statement of the research question? Is the literature reviewed current and relevant?
3. **Methods and Materials**
   Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility, and will particularly risky aspects be managed? If the project involves clinical research, are the plans for the protection of human subjects from research risks, as well as the sample size, appropriate in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?
4. **Results**
   Are the results clearly stated and appropriate for a completed project?
5. **Discussion and Conclusions**
   Are the conclusions clear, and do they accurately reflect the results?

6. **Investigator Effort/Difficulty of Study/Innovation**
   Does the project challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches, or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions examined?
7. **Format and Preparation/Grammatical Construction**
   Do references follow the *Journal of Pediatric Dentistry* format and guidelines? Do tables and figures have clear legend descriptions? Is the paper easy to understand, and does it read well?
8. **Contribution to Pediatric Dentistry**
   Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

Scoring Scale

Score	Description
5 – High	The manuscript clearly meets the criterion.
4	The manuscript effectively exceeds the standard expectations of the criterion.
3	The manuscript meets the standard expectations of the criterion.
2	The manuscript meets the minimal expectations of the criterion.
1 – Low	The manuscript clearly does not meet the criterion.

Oral Presentation Review

Evaluation Criteria

1. **Delivery and Professionalism**
   The delivery of the presentation is clear, organized, well-prepared, and professional, with visual aids that are readable, relevant, and attractive.
2. **Content and Structure**
   The content of the presentation is easy to understand and includes an introduction, purpose, methods and materials, results, discussions, and conclusions.
3. **Accuracy and Relevance**
   The information presented and literature quoted are accurate and pertinent, and include an analysis of findings compared to current literature.
4. **Knowledge and Response**
   The presenter is knowledgeable about the research project and is able to answer questions from the judges succinctly, accurately, and confidently.
5. **Study Limitations and Future Directions**
   The presenter understands the limitations of the study and the future directions and/or clinical applications of the study.
6. **Time Management**
   The presenter stays within the allotted time period.

Scoring Scale

Rating	Score
Outstanding	5
Very Good	4
Good	3
Fair	2
Poor	1
Unacceptable	0

AMERICA'S PEDIATRIC DENTISTS
THE BIG AUTHORITY on little teeth®

Research Poster Competition Review

Pre-Conference Review

Evaluation Criteria (scoring rubric included below)

1. **Relevance**
   This topic is of interest to pediatric dentists.
2. **Contribution to Knowledge**
   This presentation adds to current knowledge in the topic area or provides a worthwhile review.
3. **Scientific/Clinical Basis**
   This presentation is based on a sound scientific and/or clinical foundation.
4. **Creativity/Novelty**
   The topic exhibits a high level of creativity or novelty.
5. **Organization and Clarity**
   The presentation (written, visual, and/or verbal) is clear, logical, and well organized.
6. **Visual Appeal**
   The presentation has good visual appeal, including layout, color, and overall design scheme.

On-site Review

Evaluation Criteria

7. **Knowledge and Presentation Skills**

The student demonstrates strong knowledge, enthusiasm, and the ability to effectively answer questions in the topic area.

8. **Student Role**

The student's role in the study and presentation is clearly defined and appropriate.

AMERICA'S PEDIATRIC DENTISTS
THE BIG AUTHORITY on little teeth®

Research Poster Judging Rubric

		Scores				
		1	2	3	4	5
Grading Critera	**THIS TOPIC IS OF INTEREST TO PEDIATRIC DENTISTS.**	The topic is not relevant or of interest to pediatric dentists.	The topic is minimally relevant and unlikely to capture the interest of pediatric dentists.	The topic is somewhat relevant and may attract the interest of a subset of pediatric dentists.	The topic is highly relevant and likely to be of interest to most pediatric dentists.	The topic is exceptionally relevant and highly appealing to pediatric dentists, likely to garner widespread interest and attention.
	THIS PRESENTATION ADDS TO OUR KNOWLEDGE IN THE TOPIC AREA, OR PROVIDES A WORTHWHILE REVIEW.	The presentation does not contribute new knowledge or insight, nor does it offer a meaningful review.	The presentation adds minimal new information or offers a superficial review, providing little value to the field.	The presentation provides some new insights or offers a decent review of existing literature, adding modestly to the field.	The presentation significantly adds to existing knowledge or provides a comprehensive review, offering substantial value to the field.	The presentation offers groundbreaking insights or a highly comprehensive review, significantly advancing the field and representing a substantial contribution.
	THIS PRESENTATION IS BASED ON A SOUND SCIENTIFIC AND/OR CLINICAL BASIS.	The presentation lacks scientific or clinical foundation and is unsubstantiated.	The presentation demonstrates weak scientific or clinical support, relying on questionable sources or methodologies.	The presentation is moderately supported by scientific or clinical evidence, but may have some gaps or limitations.	The presentation is well-supported by scientific or clinical evidence, with strong methodology and reliable sources.	The presentation is thoroughly grounded in robust scientific or clinical principles, with impeccable methodology and extensive supporting evidence.
	THE TOPIC EXHIBITS A HIGH LEVEL OF CREATIVITY/NOVELTY.	The topic lacks creativity or novelty, presenting well-known concepts without innovation.	The topic demonstrates limited creativity or novelty, with few original ideas or perspectives.	The topic demonstrates limited creativity or novelty, with few original ideas or perspectives.	The topic displays good creativity or novelty, introducing several original ideas or offering unique perspectives.	The topic showcases exceptional creativity and novelty, presenting highly innovative concepts or groundbreaking approaches that significantly advance the field.
	THE PRESENTATION (WRITTEN, VISUAL AND/OR VERBAL) IS CLEAR, LOGICAL AND WELL ORGANIZED.	The presentation is confusing, illogical, or extremely poorly organized, hindering understanding.	The presentation is somewhat clear but lacks logical flow and organization, causing some	The presentation is moderately clear, with some logical flow and organization, but improvements	The presentation is clear, logical, and well-organized for the most part, facilitating understanding.	The presentation is exceptionally clear, logically structured, and well-organized throughout, enhancing understanding and
	THE PRESENTATION HAS GOOD VISUAL APPEAL (LAYOUT, COLOR, SCHEME).	The visual appeal is poor, with a confusing layout and an unattractive, distracting color scheme.	The visual appeal is lacking, with an inconsistent layout and a suboptimal color scheme that detracts from the content.	The visual appeal is average, with a decent layout and color scheme that neither significantly enhance nor detract from the content.	The visual appeal is good, with a clear layout and a pleasing color scheme that enhances the presentation of the content.	The visual appeal is exceptional, with a highly engaging layout and an attractive color scheme that significantly enhances the presentation of the content, capturing and maintaining the audience's attention.