

FDTC Review Guidelines

28 July 2020

- Rank abstracts in from poor to excellent in each of the five major categories
- For each major category, use your judgment to determine an overall rank based on the scores for the sub-categories
- Abstracts with scores in one or more red boxes should be rejected regardless of scores in any other major or sub-category

	Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
Technical Quality <i>How strong/deep is the technical content of the abstract?</i>					
Accuracy	Multiple errors in the equations, claims, tables, or figures		Minor errors in equations, claims, tables, or figures		No obvious errors in equations, claims, tables, or figures
References	Pervasive lack of appropriate citations in the technical literature to support claims made in abstract		Majority of claims supported by data or cited literature		All claims supported by references cited or new data
Technical Challenges	Author does not demonstrate an understanding of the technical challenges		Obvious technical challenges are clearly identified and addressed		All technical challenges are clearly identified and addressed
Importance/Relevance to Field <i>How important is the (proposed) scientific advancement to science and the aerospace community?</i>					
Motivation	Abstract does not motivate work		Motivation present		Clear and well-articulated motivation
Interest	Little to no new or significant scientific content of interest to the field		Topic of interest to government, industry, or academia		Topic of wide interest to government, industry, AND academia
Originality <i>How novel is the (proposed) scientific advancement?</i>					
Knowledge Advancement	Abstract does not advance knowledge in the field		Abstract advances prior work by the authors		Abstract synthesizes work from multiple research groups to produce a novel advancement
Methodology/Analysis	Work conducted with standard methods without significant change in technical approach or interpretation		Non-trivial technical approach or interpretation of technical results		A clear paradigm shift with respect to new results or a novel method
Conciseness/Style/Clarity <i>How easy is it to extract information from the abstract?</i>					
Grammar/Spelling	Persistent grammar/spelling errors		Minor grammar/spelling errors		No grammar/spelling errors
Formatting/Narrative	No attempt to follow AIAA template. No coherent narrative.		Major template sections present. Readable abstract with occasional inconsistencies in evenness of writing.		No formatting issues. Results presented clearly and succinctly.
Potential to be a Good Paper <i>How complete is the abstract compared to the full paper?</i>					
Results	No new results		At least one preliminary result		Multiple results
Work to Complete Manuscript	Work to complete manuscript not defined or not achievable in available timeframe		Clearly defined and achievable goals for final manuscript		Abstract nearly represents completed paper