

REVIEWERS RARELY DECIDE ON THE BASIS OF WHETHER
THE AUTHOR IS “RIGHT” OR “WRONG”

REVIEWERS ASK THEMSELVES:

IS THE PAPER TIMELY & ADDRESSING AN IMPORTANT
PROBLEM

DOES THE AUTHOR KNOW ABOUT THE MOST RECENT
RELEVANT WORK ON THE TOPIC

DOES THE AUTHOR SEEM LIKE SHE/HE HAS A POSSIBLE
SOLUTION

WILL THE PAPER BE COHERENT AND WELL PRESENTED?

WOULD I WANT TO HEAR THIS PAPER?

WOULD ANYONE ELSE WANT TO HEAR THIS PAPER?

Title

Problem

What is the problem?

Why is it significant?

(Beware: Is the problem too large to outline & solve in the x minutes?)

Solution

Clearly articulated and readily identifiable solution

Originality should be highlighted

Independent evidence or support

(Beware: does solution work? & does it have less complexity than the problem?)

References (often on second page)

Examples (often on second page)

ABSTRACT CHECKLIST

After writing the abstract, set it aside overnight.

Then hone twice against these questions:

- ✓ IS THE TYPEFACE TOO SMALL?
- ✓ ARE THERE ANY ERRORS IN SPELLING OR GRAMMAR?
- ✓ IS THE ABSTRACT LIMIT RESPECTED?
- ✓ IS THE EXPRESSION OF IDEAS AS CLEAR AS CAN BE?
- ✓ IS THE ORGANIZATION OF THE ABSTRACT SHARP, TIGHT, & UNAVOIDABLE?
- ✓ IS THERE AN EMPIRICAL FACET OF THE PAPER?
- ✓ IS THERE A THEORETICAL/GENERAL FACET OF THE PAPER?
- ✓ DOES THE TITLE HIGHLIGHT THE MAIN POINT

Have another set of eyes read it. LISTEN to the feedback.