

Review guidelines for Abstract Assessment

A. Scoring Criteria

Each abstract should be assessed and scored on a scale of **1 (Poor)** to **5 (Excellent)** for the following five criteria:

1. Relevance to Conference Themes

- Does the abstract align with the core themes of physical activity, public health, policy, or related areas in the Southeast Asian context?

2. Scientific or Scholarly Quality

- Is the methodology sound? Are the findings valid and based on adequate data or theoretical reasoning?

3. Originality and Innovation

- Does the work present new ideas, concepts, methods, or approaches?

4. Clarity and Structure

- Is the abstract well-written, logically structured, and easy to understand?

5. Impact and Practical Significance

- Does the work have potential implications for practice, policy, or future research?
-

B. Final Recommendation

Please indicate one of the following recommendations:

- Accept (in its current form)
 - Requires Revision
 - Reject
-

C. Suggested Presentation Format

Based on the quality and nature of the abstract, please suggest the most appropriate presentation format:

- Oral Presentation
 - Mini-Oral Presentation
 - Poster Presentation
-

D. Submission Timeline

We would greatly appreciate it if you could complete and submit your review **within two weeks** of receiving the assignment.

If you anticipate any delays or need an extension, please inform us as soon as possible.

Additional Notes

- This document is also available within the reviewer portal.
- Please ensure objectivity and confidentiality in your evaluations.

A. Reviewer and abstract ID

Reviewer Name	
Abstract Title	
Submission ID	

B. Abstract assessment

Criteria	Scale 1-5				
	1 Poor	2 Below average	3 Average	4 Good	5 Excellent
Relevance to Conference Themes <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clearly aligns with physical activity, health promotion, or public healthRelevant to Southeast Asian contextTopic suitable for SEAPAC 2025	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scientific/Scholarly Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clear research objective or hypothesisSound and appropriate methodologyResults presented (if applicable) are valid and coherentConclusion is justified by data or arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Originality and Innovation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Presents novel approach or findingsOffers new insights or perspectivesAvoids duplication of existing studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity and Structure <ul style="list-style-type: none">Well-organized (Background, Objective, Methods, Results, Conclusion)Language is clear and professional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact and Practical Significance <ul style="list-style-type: none">Demonstrates potential for real-world application or policy impactRelevant to health promotion or community-level interventionsAdds value to regional/national practice in Southeast Asia	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SCORE	DESCRIPTOR	EXPLANATION
5	Excellent	Fully meets and exceeds all criteria - Highly relevant and impactful - Innovative, well-structured, and clearly written
4	Very Good	Meets most criteria very well - Relevant and well-executed - Minor weaknesses that do not compromise overall quality
3	Good	Adequately meets criteria - Some areas need improvement - Reasonably clear and relevant
2	Fair	Partially meets criteria - Significant weaknesses in methodology, relevance, or clarity - Needs major improvement
1	Poor	Fails to meet core criteria - Off-topic, poorly structured, or unclear - Not suitable for presentation

Total Score (out of 25) Suggested Recommendation

22–25	Accept – Oral Presentation
20–21	Accept – Mini Oral Presentation
18–20	Accept – Poster Presentation
15–17	Minor Revision
< 15	Reject

C. Final Recommendation:

- ☐ Accept – Oral Presentation
- ☐ Accept – Mini Oral Presentation
- ☐ Accept – Poster Presentation
- ☐ Minor Revision Required
- ☐ Reject

Common Grounds for Rejection (Check if applicable): Off-topic or unrelated to conference, Incomplete (e.g., missing methods/results), Duplicate or plagiarized content, Poor language or structure impairs understanding

D. Reviewer comments for authors: