

WM SYMPOSIA ABSTRACT REVIEW GUIDANCE

Purpose

This document provides guidance for abstract reviews. Review each abstract for quality, relevance, presentation format, and placement within the WM Conference Program. Each track has provisional topics for abstract placement, but they may be changed during abstract review to better describe the abstracts placed within an oral session.

Review Requirements. All abstracts, including invited abstracts, are subject to review:

Each abstract must be reviewed by at least **two qualified WM Reviewers**. (Non-qualifying Reviewers are the Author or Co-Author(s), a member of the submitting organization, a direct competitor (or otherwise have an actual or perceived conflict of interest), or someone not knowledgeable on the topic.)

- **Accept:** Requires agreement from two Reviewers
- **Mandatory revision(s) for Paper/Presentation:** Requires agreement from two Reviewers and concurrence from the lead or designated Lead Track Co-Chair
- **Reject:** Requires agreement from two Reviewers, concurrence from the lead or designated lead Track Co-Chair, and final approval by the PAC Chair

What to Evaluate. Consider whether the abstract:

- Falls within the scope of the WM Conference
- Provides useful and significant information for attendees
- Clearly identifies the purpose, approach, results, and value of the work
- Contains sufficient technical or policy/program content
- Presents original or meaningfully updated work
- Is free from excessive commercial or sales content
- Complies with the Call for Participation and PAC Policies
- Is assigned to the most appropriate Track, Topic, and presentation format
- Previously published or presented work should only be accepted when it contains substantial new information, updated results, or a materially different analysis.
- Commercial sales presentations and proposed exceptions must be referred to the PAC Chair for consideration of the non-paper poster session.

Recommended Disposition. For each abstract, select the most appropriate outcome considering the author's preference for Oral or Poster Session:

- Accept for Oral presentation
- Accept for Poster presentation
- Transfer to another Topic or Track, if appropriate (Transfers between Tracks require agreement from the originating and receiving Track Co-Chairs.)
- Request mandatory revision
- Possible combination with a related abstract - Only combine abstracts when they involve the same authors, organization, or project, and all affected authors agree. (To be determined by organizers at PDM)
- Assign to the Non-Paper Poster Session
- Reject (Before recommending rejection, consider whether the abstract would be suitable for the **Non-Paper Poster Session**. This permits presentation but not publication in the Proceedings.)

Oral or Poster. Poster presentations are equal in value to Oral presentations and should be selected when they provide the better format. An Author who requested Poster presentation must not be moved to an Oral Session without written agreement. A Poster may be more appropriate when the work:

- Does not fit coherently within an available Oral Session
- Benefits from detailed one-to-one discussion
- Requires extensive visual explanation
- Appeals to a small specialist audience
- Presents a high risk of Presenter cancellation
- Presenter already has **two Oral presentations** during the Conference.

Session Development. Group the accepted abstracts into Sessions with a clear and coherent theme so that:

- **Full Oral Session.** Normally 7 to 8 presentations (A topic with 6 or fewer abstracts should be reduced to a Half Session unless additional abstracts are confirmed)
- **Half Oral Session.** Normally 3 to 4 presentations (A topic with 2 or fewer abstracts should be merged with another Session unless additional abstracts are confirmed,)
- **Poster sub-topics Sessions.** Normally 5 to 15 abstracts but there is no limit on the number of posters per sub-topic.

Sessions should:

- Reflect the content of the accepted abstracts
- Avoid domination by one organization, product, or viewpoint
- Progress logically from overview to detailed content, if possible
- Have reliable presenters slotted first in a session or first after the break
- Place high cancellation-risk presentations at the end of the session

Each Session must have:

- A clear Session title
- Presentation order
- Lead Session Organizer
- Two Session Co-Chairs
- Paper Reviewer
- Poster Judge (if applicable)

Final Check. Before completing review, confirm that:

- The disposition is clear
- Required approvals have been obtained
- Any revision or rejection rationale is specific and documented