

## Important instructions for reviewers

***Please print these instructions and have them to hand whilst you are reviewing. We ask that you follow the guidelines given when allocating your scores to ensure consistency in scoring methodology between reviewers.***

Thank you for reviewing abstracts submitted for the ISUOG World Congress 2026.

**Reviewing deadline date: Monday 13 April 2026 (17:00 UK time)**

If you have been assigned both general abstracts and case reports, you will have seen these options available to you on the main "Review" tab. To switch between the two, please return to the main "Review" tab and select the other option. If you did not see this option, then you have only been assigned general abstracts.

Authors have been asked to categorise their abstracts as either a **general abstract** or a **case report**. The Scientific Committee has decided that the scoring between general abstracts and case reports should be the same, so please bear this in mind if you have reviewed for us previously.

## Scoring

### *General abstracts and Case reports*

- Please note the scoring this year for case reports follows the same rules as for general abstracts.
- Each abstract should be scored using one overall score from 1-10.
- The maximum total score per abstract is 10. Your score should reflect your judgement on the originality of the idea, the methods used, clinical significance of the results and whether the end conclusion is appropriate.
- The score guide below indicates how you should apply your scores.

Score	Overall impression
10	Excellent
9	Excellent
8	Very good
7	Very good
6	Good / Fair
5	Good / Fair
4	Poor
3	Poor
2	Extremely poor
1	Extremely poor

## **Further instructions**

- Only those abstracts which have been assigned to you are available to you for review and scoring.
- Abstracts can only be scored once. If you score the abstract(s) more than once, the last score will replace the previous score(s).
- If you have any comments to make with regards to a specific abstract, by clicking on the Control ID you will see a 'Confidential Comment' box show above the abstract text. Once you have entered your comment click the 'Save' button and close the window. Your comment will be made available to the Program Committee.
- The abstracts should be handled as confidential material.

- You can read and score the abstracts on the screen or you can print the abstracts and score them and input your scores on the screen later.
- By using the ID code assigned to you, you confirm that you did these reviews yourself, without a conflict of interest\*.
- If you have a conflict of interest\*, leave the scores for that abstract blank and tick the '**conflict of interest**' box so that we can reassign the abstract to another reviewer in good time before the deadline date.
- If you think an abstract has been submitted in the wrong category, please tick the '**wrong category**' box. Please continue to review the abstract if possible, and **recommend a new topic in the comments box** within the abstract text window and the abstract will be reallocated.
- If you don't feel you have the appropriate expertise to review an abstract please leave the scores blank and tick the '**reallocate**' box, **stating the reason for reallocation** in the comments box within the abstract text window.
- Three independent reviewers will score each abstract and the Program Committee will finalise the scientific program based on the reviewers' scoring results.

### **Use of generative AI tools in peer review**

Manuscripts submitted to UOG are confidential, and reviewers are expected to uphold this confidentiality throughout the peer-review process. It is strictly prohibited to enter any part of a manuscript under review into AI-powered chatbots or other generative AI tools, where confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

Moreover, reviewers should be aware that generative AI tools may introduce [factual inaccuracies](#), misinterpret scientific content, produce biased output or even be prone to manipulation, all of which can compromise the integrity of the peer-review process. Reviews should reflect the reviewer's own expert judgment and provide a critical, informed evaluation of the manuscript, to support the editorial decision-making process.

For the above reasons, the use of generative AI in preparing reviews is prohibited by UOG and may lead to removal from the reviewer database or exclusion from future editorial activities."

*\*A conflict of interest would be direct involvement in or affiliation with the study and/or authors.*

### **Questions?**

Please contact the ISUOG Secretariat if you have any questions regarding the review process. Please be aware that our office is located in London, United Kingdom and open Monday to Friday (09:00 – 17:00 UK time), but we will endeavour to get back to you as quickly as possible.

E: [abstracts@isuog.org](mailto:abstracts@isuog.org)

T: +44 (0)20 7471 9955