***Case Report/Series* Abstract Evaluation Rubric**

| **Criterion** | **Excellent** **(5)** | **Good** **(4)** | **Satisfactory** **(3)** | **Needs Improvement (2)** | **Poor** **(1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Background/Rationale** | Exceptional and relevant | Solid & relevant | Acceptable | Insufficient | Not included |
| **Objective(s)** | Clear, well-defined, significant novelty/implications | Clear, defined, but may not be significantly novel | Present but lacks some clarity & originality | Poorly defined, lacks focus | Not included |
| **Case Description** | Comprehensive, well-organized; clear description of clinical features, diagnosis, course of treatment, and outcome | Well-described, most key details included but some minor aspects lack clarity or detail | Adequate information but some important details are missing or unclear | Incomplete or lacks clarity, critical information is missing | Not included |
| **Conclusion/Clinical Significance** | Demonstrates clear clinical significance & provides valuable insight into diagnosis, treatment, or outcomes | Clinically relevant and provides some value but may not highlight a major learning point | Relevant, but significance to clinical practice or the field is not fully articulated | Lacks clear clinical relevance or value to practice or education | Not included |
| **Clarity and Organization** | Well-organized, easy to follow, clear writing with no grammatical or typographical errors | Generally well-organized and clear, with minor issues in writing or organization | Some issues with organization or clarity, some grammatical or typographical errors | Poorly organized or unclear, multiple grammatical or typographical errors | Disorganized and unclear; difficult to read or follow |