



INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE & MIGRATION HEALTH CONFERENCE

Abstract Peer / Self-Review Checklist and Rubric

Overview

Use this checklist before submitting your abstract to the [International Refugee and Migration Health Conference](#) to ensure your abstract meets the criteria, leaves a positive impression on peer reviewers, and increases chances of acceptance.

Instructions for Use

1. For each section, **score how well the abstract meets the criteria** using the scoring rubric.
 - a. Page 2: General Abstract Requirements Checklist
 - b. Pages 3-4: Research Oral Abstracts and Posters Checklist
 - c. Pages 5-6: Health Programming Oral Abstracts and Posters Checklist
 - d. Pages 7-8: Workshops & Panels Checklist
2. Use the **Notes** section to detail specific feedback or suggestions for improvement.
3. Revise your abstract based on areas **scoring 0, 1, or 2** before abstract submission.
4. Consider sharing with a colleague or mentor for additional feedback or guidance.

Scoring Rubric

0 = Missing, very unclear, or criteria not met

2 = Adequate, but could be stronger

1 = Needs major improvement

3 = Strong, clear, and well-aligned with criteria

Next Steps

After scoring your abstract using the following pages, you can:

1. Revise your abstract based on areas that scored 2, 1, or 0.
2. Share your abstract and this checklist with a colleague or mentor for peer review.
3. Use this checklist for a final check before submitting your abstract in our conference portal.

[We look forward to reviewing your abstract submission!](#)

General Abstract Requirements

Criteria	Score (0 - 3)	Notes
Is the abstract within the 250-word limit (excluding title and author(s))?		
Is the abstract free of spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors?		
Is the abstract written in the past tense and not future tense?		
Are acronyms spelled out on first use and is jargon minimized?		
Does the abstract highlight what is new, innovative, or important about the work?		
Is it clear why this abstract topic matters to refugee/migrant health audiences or practice?		
Does the abstract detail meaningful engagement of people with lived experience in the research or programming, including (but not limited to) as co-authors?		
Does the abstract include diverse perspectives, including multiple programs, institutions, and/or geographical locations?		

Research or Health Programming: Oral Abstracts and Posters

Criteria	Score (0 - 3)	Notes
Background		
Is the problem or issue (hypothesis, research question, study aim, project purpose, or thesis) clearly stated?		
Is the context (including location, timeframe, and health topic) or significance briefly explained?		
Is there a clear link to refugee or migration health?		
Methods		
Research: Is the methodology (study design or program approach) clearly described? Health programming: Is the health programming clearly described, including relevant health/public health models the programming draws from?		
Are the setting and participants/population identified including the sample size?		
Research: Are data sources, key variables, and/or analytical methods mentioned (as applicable)? Health programming: Are rigorous evaluations / outcomes measures mentioned?		
Are ethical considerations addressed, if relevant?		

Scoring Rubric

0 = Missing, very unclear, or criteria not met

2 = Adequate, but could be stronger

1 = Needs major improvement

3 = Strong, clear, and well-aligned with criteria

Research or Health Programming: Oral Abstracts and Posters (Continued)

Criteria	Score (0 - 3)	Notes
Results		
Are results clearly summarized?		
Research: Are data included (e.g., numbers, themes, or examples) rather than vague statements or that data collection/analysis is pending? Health programming: Are outputs and outcomes clearly described?		
Are the results relevant to the stated methods and objectives?		
*Tip: Avoid starting with “results will be discussed”, “results are pending”, or omitting findings entirely - this often leads to abstract rejection.		
Conclusion		
Is the key takeaway or interpretation stated clearly?		
Is there a mention of impact, implications, or recommendations for refugee or migration health?		
Does the conclusion logically follow from the results?		

Scoring Rubric

0 = Missing, very unclear, or criteria not met

2 = Adequate, but could be stronger

1 = Needs major improvement

3 = Strong, clear, and well-aligned with criteria

Workshops & Panels

Criteria	Score (0 - 3)	Notes
Background		
Is the problem or issue clearly stated?		
Is the context or significance briefly explained, referencing review of multiple studies and literature?		
Is there a clear link to refugee or migration health?		
Content		
Are 2-3 workshop learning objectives clearly described?		
Are 2-3 key points that will be made during the workshop clearly outlined?		
Does this content merit an hour-long session?		
Are ethical considerations addressed, if relevant?		

Scoring Rubric

0 = Missing, very unclear, or criteria not met

2 = Adequate, but could be stronger

1 = Needs major improvement

3 = Strong, clear, and well-aligned with criteria

Workshops & Panels (Continued)

Criteria	Score (0 - 3)	Notes
Instructional Methods		
Are the instructional methods clearly described?		
Are the instructional methods interactive, hands-on, and prioritize principles of adult learning?		
Will attendees learn practical skills or tools that can be utilized in their daily work?		
<p><i>*Tip: If your instructional methods include majority lecture or presentation-style with very little time for audience questions, activities or other interactive elements, your workshop is less competitive.</i></p>		
Speaker Biographies	Score (0 - 3)	Notes
Are succinct biographies for each workshop or panel speaker included in the submission?		
Do the biographies sufficiently describe each speakers' expertise and knowledge of the topic?		
Do the biographies include details about speakers' experience presenting similar content / in a similar format?		

Scoring Rubric

0 = Missing, very unclear, or criteria not met

2 = Adequate, but could be stronger

1 = Needs major improvement

3 = Strong, clear, and well-aligned with criteria