

2024 BMES CMBE Conference

January 2-6, 2024 | The Royal Sonesta San Juan | San Juan, Puerto Rico

"Systems Bioengineering: From Molecules to Cells to Tissues" the local dive

Post-Doc Travel Award Eligibility: Applicants must be Post-doctoral Researchers (PhD awarded, but have not started an independent lab) at the time of application. Abstracts should present work completed while the applicant was a Post-doctoral Researcher.

Significance			
<u>Criteria</u>	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores	Max Score	Assigned Score
cores should reflect the importance of the <u>work presented in the abstract,</u> with respect to the relevant literature and the work's impact to the field of CMBE. Studies providing mechanistic insight, developing new technologies, and/or enabling translational activities are of particular interest	 5: Reveals long sought-after mechanism / Presents ground-breaking technology / Describes translational approach to major clinical need / Other equivalent accomplishment 4: Reveals important mechanism / Presents exciting new technology / Describes translational approach to minor clinical need / Other equivalent accomplishment 3: Refines well-studied mechanism / Present a new technology/ Refines existing translational approach / Other equivalent accomplishment 2: Focuses on technical details or approaches of some interest to the CMBE field 1: Focuses on technical details or approaches largely not of general interest to the CMBE field 	5	
novation			
Criteria	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores	Max Score	Assigned Score
Scores should reflect the overall conceptual and/or technical innovation the work presented in abstract with respect to current approaches in CMBE. Approaches enabling studies in new sub-fields of CMBE, probing new scales/concepts in existing sub-fields, or integrating diverse sub-fields are of particular interest	 5: Study opens new sub-field, probes existing sub-field in new way, integrates multiple subfields for the first time, and/or other equivalent characteristic 4: One of first studies in new sub-field, using new techniques, integrating multiple sub-fields, and/or other equivalent characteristic 3: Focuses on an established field of research 2: A confirmative study using novel approaches 1: Largely a confirmative study using established techniques 	5	
echnical Content			
<u>Criteria</u>	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores	Max Score	Assigned Score
Presented results are quantitative, clearly, and concisely summarized, sufficiently powered, potentially repeatable, and appropriately interpreted	 5: All aspects of technical content are high quality 4: Most aspects of technical content are high quality 3: Some aspects of technical content are high quality 2: Few aspects of technical content are high quality 1: Very few aspects of technical content are high quality 	5	
Nriting Style and Figure Presentation			
<u>Criteria</u>	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores	Max Score	Assigned Score
Writing style is high quality: lacking excessive technical jargon, is clear and concise, has a logical flow, lacks typos, and communicates main points effectively. Figures are of high quality, easily read, and readily convey important aspects of data	 5: All aspects of writing and figures are high quality 4: Most aspects of writing and figures are high quality 3: Some aspects of writing and figures are high quality 2: Few aspects of writing and figures are high quality 1: Very few aspects of writing and figures are high quality 	5	

Technical Content	
Criteria	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores
	5: All aspects of technical content are high quality
	4: Most aspects of technical content are high quality
Presented results are quantitative, clearly, and concisely summarized,	3: Some aspects of technical content are high quality
sufficiently powered, potentially repeatable, and appropriately interpreted	2: Few aspects of technical content are high quality
	1: Very few aspects of technical content are high quality

Writing Style and Figure Presentation	
Criteria	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores
	5: All aspects of writing and figures are high quality
Writing style is high quality: lacking excessive technical jargon, is clear and	4: Most aspects of writing and figures are high quality
concise, has a logical flow, lacks typos, and communicates main points	3: Some aspects of writing and figures are high quality
effectively. Figures are of high quality, easily read, and readily convey important aspects of data	2: Few aspects of writing and figures are high quality
	1: Very few aspects of writing and figures are high quality

Inv	Actio	gator
111V	CSLIE	αιυι

<u>Criteria</u>

Productivity of the investigator, <u>based on career stage, standards of</u> <u>pertinent CMBE sub-field, and in reference to the biosketch.</u>

Impact of the investigator's entire body of work, <u>based on career stage and</u> in reference to the biosketch.

Overall investigator score: This score should reflect the overall quality of the investigator's <u>entire body of work based on career stage and in reference</u> <u>to the biosketch</u>. As this is a research award, primary emphasis should be placed on research achievements. Secondarily, other contributions, such as those to education and service, may be considered. <u>Applicants may alter</u>

their biosketch from strict NIH/NSF guidelines to highlight key contributions.

Overall Score of Application

<u>Criteria</u>

The overall application score should represent the overall quality of the application as subject to the opinion of the reviewer in response to a wholistic review of the entire application.

Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity

Criteria

A major goal of the CMBE SIG is to support and promote a vibrant, diverse, equitable and inclusive research community. In your opinion, will the applicant contribute to a fuller representation of perspectives within the CMBE SIG? This is intended to be a holistic assessment that considers any of a broad range of factors that could be relevant to CMBE, including, but not limited to, demonstrated leadership, resilience/persistence, background, life experience, culture, race, ethnicity, work, and dedicated to projects or causes. <u>Applicants are encouraged alter their biosketch from</u> <u>strict NIH/NSF guidelines to highlight relevant factors, if they wish.</u>

5: Exceptional productivity, 4: Outstanding Productivity, 3: Good Productivity, 2: Average Productivity, 1: Weak Productivity, 2: Average Productivity, 1: Weak Productivity, 2: Average Productivit

Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores

5: Exceptional Impact, 4: Outstanding Impact, 3: Good Impact, 2: Average Impact, 1: Less than Average Impact

5: Exceptional Body of Work, 4: Outstanding Body of Work, 3: Good Body of Work, 2: Average Body of Work, 1: Le Average Body of Work

Reviewer Comments, Score Driving Factors

Explanation

	Max Score	Assigned Score
Productivity	5	
	5	
Less than	5	
	Max Score	Assigned Score
	5	
		Answer
	Y/N?	