

Young Investigator Award (YIA) Judging Criteria – SfRBM Annual Meeting

SCORING CRITERIA & AWARD ELIGIBILITY

- Each candidate will receive 3 **scores** from individual judges at the Annual Meeting, plus a 4th **score** taken from on-line abstract evaluations which are double-blinded (completed in late September). Final **grades** will be the average of these 4 scores. Additional scores from judges other than those assigned to that individual abstract will not be considered.
- Candidates receiving average grades of 22-24 or above will be considered for Young Investigator Award. Those receiving average grades at or below a range of 18-21 will usually not be eligible for an award.

QUALIFICATIONS/EXPECTATIONS FOR YIA JUDGES

- Must have at least 2 papers in the field as a corresponding author within the last 3 years.
- The SfRBM Junior Awards Committee will invite selected members to serve as judges to encourage diversity (areas of interest, gender, geography).
- Potential pitfalls to be avoided:
 - Any sort of potential bias or perceived conflict of interest. Judges should not evaluate presentations related to their own work or to work from previous trainees', collaborators' or individuals from the same institution.
 - Tendency to avoid controversial topics or emphasize sound but incremental studies.
 - Tendency to confuse the candidate's enthusiasm with knowledge.
- Judging criteria will be clearly communicated to all participants (both judges and YIA candidates) prior to the meeting.

JUDGES SCORING

- Each individual score will be composed of 3 items/areas:
 - ACCURACY (0 - 10)
 - **Quality of data presentation and discussion** (major criterion)
 - Use of adequate / state-of-the-art methods
 - Technical excellence

- IMPACT / INCREMENTAL CONTRIBUTION (0 - 10)
 - **Originality and extent of conceptual novelty** (major criterion)
 - Degree of advance over previous knowledge
 - Relevance
 - **Strength of mechanistic insights** (major criterion)
 - Completeness
 - Potential implications for other fields
- PRESENTER (0 - 10)
 - **Critical thinking on results and related work** (major criterion)
 - Knowledge level
 - Quality, clarity and depth of presentation and ability to answer questions
- The final individual grade will be the sum of these 3 items/areas (0 – 30).

CALCULATING THE FINAL GRADE - EXAMPLE

Judge #1 score: 24
 Judge #2 score: 26
 Judge #3 score: 22

Online abstract review* 8.3 x 3 = 24.9

**Since the online abstract review scores range from 1 to 10, the total here is multiplied by 3.*

Final grade would be: 24+26+22+24.9 = 96.9 --> 96.9/4 scores = **24.2**

*Updated by the SfRBM Junior Awards Committee
 9/13/11*