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1. **Definition**

In the understanding of the Swiss Society of Cardiology (SSC) an abstract is a brief condensed summary of an original research or a case report. It may act as a stand-alone entity instead of a full paper or it may succinctly communicate contents of a more detailed research article. Abstracts are used as the basis for selecting research that is proposed for presentation in the form of a poster, oral presentation or other format at the annual conference of the SSC.

2. **Purpose**

The Swiss Society of Cardiology offers a platform at its annual conference where scientific writers are offered the possibility to present their work and themselves, exchange ideas and make contact with their peers. Bearing this in mind, the hurdle for submission and acceptance of scientific abstracts should be generously set and abstract should be attributed adequate time slots to allow for presentation. This especially should give physicians in advanced training a possibility to ascertain their participation at the annual conference. Prizes for the best abstracts announced and advertised beforehand should guarantee a higher quality of submitted abstracts and serve as an incentive as well as award for good research.

3. **Responsibilities**

Abstract submission, abstract reviewing and all connected tasks are the responsibility of the scientific committee of annual meeting of the Swiss Society of Cardiology (SSC). The scientific committee may delegate responsibilities and tasks but remains responsible for overall supervision and especially for the rules applying to submission and reviewing. Tasks are delegated to the review board, to the reviewers, to the chairs of abstract sessions, to the Working Groups of the SSC, partner and/or guest societies whose members are also submitting abstracts, and to the congress organization (see below).

---

1. Detailed information on selection of prizewinners etc. will follow in another paper.
4. Review board

Definition

The review board is a committee of 2 to 4 persons delegated by the scientific board of the annual conference of the SSC to supervise the abstract submission and reviewing process in its name.

Tasks and Responsibilities of the Review board

The review board is responsible for the following tasks:

- Proposing to the scientific committee a mode of cut-off (e.g. an exact number, a percentage or a certain average grade) for deciding on acceptance or rejection of submitted abstracts. This should take place prior and independently to the abstract submission.
- Determination of the number of reviewers per topic.
- Selection of the reviewers from the names proposed by the working groups of the SSC as well as guest and/or partner societies of annual meeting also submitting abstracts.
- Checking the appropriate allocation of abstracts to the different topics.
- Ensuring reviewers do not rate scientific abstracts they are themselves involved in closely (i.e. co-authors, same working groups etc.).
- Making certain, there are no extreme outliers among the grades. If deemed necessary, corrections are to be made by the review board.
- Proposing to the scientific committee the format the accepted abstracts are to be designated to.
- The scientific committee has the right to establish other abstract presentation formats and to assign accepted abstract to these as long as the criteria are met.
- Acting as arbiter in cases where abstracts have received the same average grades.
- Determining the prizewinners in each topic based on the average grades. If there is a tie for the prize, the review board will select a winner and propose the name to the scientific committee for final decision.
- Providing the Working Groups of the SSC and/or the partner/guest societies with lists of the abstracts accepted for oral presentation together with the number of sessions these are to be allocated to.
- Giving titles to the Clinical Cases Sessions and other formats (such as moderated poster sessions) where no Working Group and/or partner/guest society is responsible.
- Selecting and contacting the chairs from the names proposed by the Working Groups and/or partner/guest societies.
- Choosing chairs for those sessions where no Working Group and/or partner/guest society is responsible.
- Providing feedback to the scientific committee on necessary alterations in the abstract submission and review process for the following year(s).
- To write a “Review Guideline” on how to review abstracts, how the grades are to be given and in what cases reviewers need to declare themselves prejudiced. The Review Guideline needs to be approved by the scientific committee.
- To write an “Abstract guideline” on which abstracts should be submitted to whom and to what topics. “The Abstract guideline” needs to be approved by the scientific committee.

2 Topics having resulted in many equal average grades in the years 2011 and 2012: SSCC, topics 1, 2 and 7. But even ten or more reviewers have not always prevented equal average grades when a system of full grades between 1 and 6 was used.
3 To ascertain that this happens only if absolutely necessary, reviewers are provided with a “Review Guideline” on how to review the abstracts.
4 Taking into account that an adequate representation of the different languages and regions as well as universities, hospitals and private offices is wished for by the SSC.
To adjust the “Timetable” every year for the next conference well in advance of the review process taking into account the print deadline of the abstract book.

To provide the timetable and the “Review Guidelines” to the presidents of the working groups when asking them to propose their reviewers.

Providing feedback to the working groups of the SSC as well as guest and/or partner societies on who has not or has not on time completed the reviewing tasks.

5. Working Groups, Partner societies and guest societies

The Working Groups of the Swiss Society of Cardiology in the person of their presidents are responsible for proposal of suitable reviewers. Whenever possible these reviewers should be contacted prior to their proposal to the review board. The presidents of the working groups should provide the potential reviewers with the “Review Guideline” as well as the timetable before their decision. This applies accordingly to partner and/or guest societies whose members are also submitting abstracts to the annual conference of the SSC.

As soon as the review process is over, the review board will provide the presidents of the Working Groups and/or the partner/guest societies respectively with the list of accepted abstracts for oral presentation in their topics. The presidents are asked to allocate the abstracts to the sessions (the number of sessions will be indicated by the review board), give titles to these sessions and to propose persons as chairs for these sessions. If sessions contain abstracts from different Working groups and or societies, the parties involved may need to consult with each other.

6. Reviewers

- Reviewers should be versed in the field of specialty they are to review. Nevertheless it is important to keep a balance between older and more experienced professionals and younger scientists/specialists.
- A continuous renewal of the reviewer pool is recommended and replacement of part of the pool each year should be a defined goal of all parties involved.
- Reviewers no longer working clinically and/or scientifically should preferably be excluded as reviewers at the latest two years after their retirement.
- The Working Groups of the SSC will propose members as reviewers to the scientific committee.
- Guest and/or partner societies of the annual meeting also submitting abstracts are likewise entitled to propose reviewers.
- Potential reviewers should be contacted by the Working Groups, guest or partner societies prior to their name being submitted to the review board.
- Reviewers need to declare their affiliation and potential conflicts of interest to the review board (see declaration of affiliation and potential conflict of interest).
- The review board will define the minimal number of reviewers per topic. The number of reviewers should be large enough to minimize the number of abstracts with the same average grade.
- The review board will decide on the final composition of the reviewer groups for each topic.
- Specialists from different professions should be designated to the different topics depending on their field of specialty and not with regard to their professional affiliation.
Declaration of affiliation and potential conflicts of interest

Reviewers with overt or probable personal interests (e.g. in the form of co-authorship; provision of writing assistance, administrative support, equipment, expert opinion or reviewing) in certain abstracts submitted to the Annual Meeting should exclude themselves or be excluded from reviewing these same abstracts. The review board is responsible for monitoring this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation and potential conflicts of interest disclosure form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I am working | □ In a private office  
□ In an institution (eg. hospital, laboratory, university)  
□ In a private office as well as in an institution  
□ Other: ______________________________ |
| Name of institution |                                             |
| Name of department, unit or division |                                             |
| Name of working group(s) |                                             |
| Name of second institution |                                             |
| Name of department, unit or division |                                             |
| Name of working group(s) |                                             |
| Name of articles or abstract reference number |                                             |

Reviewers will receive this affiliation form (as a PDF file) together with their access codes. They will have to fill in the form, which should be electronically sent back to the congress organization that will forward the information to the review board.

7. Review Guideline

This information is meant for all reviewers. As a reviewer you will receive this information when first being contacted by a Working Group of the SSC, one of its partner societies or guest societies also submitting abstracts to the annual meeting. Ideally with your first contact you should also receive the exact timing of the review process so that you can take your availability into account when deciding to accept or decline the task of reviewing.

If you agree to be reviewer you also consent to abide by this guideline.

It is the aim of the scientific committee to provide young authors and scientists with an opportunity to present themselves and their research at the annual conference of the Swiss Society of Cardiology. Scientific criteria should be met for acceptance but leniency should be applied when grading. Rigorous rejection of abstracts is not wished for.

Tasks and Responsibilities of Reviewers

- Please review all abstracts in the topic you have been appointed to by the same rules.
- Please consistently give grades to the abstracts based on the criteria listed below.
- Please complete reviewing by the date set. Your name will be reported to your Working Group or your society if you miss the date without explanation.
- Please desist from reviewing an abstract when prejudiced. Terms of prejudice are met, when the reviewer is co-author of the abstract, when one of the authors is from the same working group or whenever you otherwise feel influenced in your objectivity (e.g. kinship etc.).
Reviewing Criteria

Please read the list of criteria carefully before beginning to give points to the abstracts assigned to you, even if you have used the criteria before.

Please keep in mind all of the 14 criteria listed below. In the end, give an overall grade between 1 and 10 with 1 being the lowest grade and 10 being the highest grade. The highest grade should be reserved for abstracts fulfilling all of the 14 criteria exceeding expectations and. The lowest grade should be reserved for abstracts missing all of the below listed criteria.

The grading system has been expanded to 10 as the maximum grade in order to prevent similar mathematical means from resulting for different abstracts. Please keep this in mind when grading and try not to give the same grade to every abstract you review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity and Completeness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Abstract organization and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clarity of purpose/objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Review of relevant literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance/Significance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Contribution to Science and/or Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fit with Conference Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach/Methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Scientific Quality/Rigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Data Collection and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Appropriateness of Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lessons Learned/Conclusion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Implications/Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Relevance to the Broad Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While reviewing the abstract online, you may tick the box “own abstract” when you are the main author or a co-author of the abstract otherwise compromised regarding objective reviewing. By selecting the box it will not be possible to review the abstract anymore.
8. Congress Organization

The timetable for the abstract submission and review process as defined by the Scientific Committee is an integral part of the agreement between the SSC and the congress organization pertaining to the tasks delegated to the congress organization in context of the abstract submission and review process. The congress organization will abide by the timetable (see below). The timetable will be sent to the congress organization prior to finalization for reviewing.

Tasks and Responsibilities of the Congress Organization in connection with the Abstract Submission and Review Process

- Correspondence connected with the invitation and confirmation of authors, reviewers and chairs on behalf of the Scientific Committee
- Advertisement of abstract submission
- Administration of authors, reviewers and chairs corresponding addresses including their institutional affiliation (including “Affiliation and potential conflicts of interest disclosure form”)
- Administration of abstracts and related information (authors, grades etc.)
- Provision of a internet portal for online abstract submission
  - Information entered into the system should whenever necessary and appropriate be recognized as individual variables e.g. for each author first name, last name, title, institution, working group or ward, age, street, street number, zip code, city, country, etc.
  - Data entry should enable data analysis. Analysis could aim on providing statistics useful to the society to ameliorate the abstract submission and reviewing process (e.g. distribution of affiliation of authors, distribution of abstracts by topics or by society)
- Provision of a solution for online reviewing
  - Information entered into the system should whenever necessary and appropriate be recognized as individual variables e.g. for each reviewer first name, last name, title, institution, working group or ward, age, street, street number, zip code, city, country, grade given etc.
  - Data entry should enable data analysis. Analysis could aim on providing statistics useful to the society to ameliorate the abstract reviewing process (e.g. distribution of grades for a certain abstract, distribution of grades given by a certain reviewer etc.)
- Processing of information by authors and reviewers entered online for further treatment by the review board reviewers etc.
- Feedback to the review board on possible amendments in the submission and review process for the next annual conference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing of timetable to conference organization</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>9/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing of timetable</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>9/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance of “Review Guideline”</td>
<td>Scientific committee</td>
<td>23.09.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance of “Abstract guideline”</td>
<td>Scientific committee</td>
<td>23.09.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance of timetable</td>
<td>Scientific committee</td>
<td>23.09.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to working groups / partner and guest societies to propose reviewers with indication of number of reviewers</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>31.10.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of online submission internet portal</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>01.11.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for reviewers to review board</td>
<td>Working groups / partner and guest societies</td>
<td>27.11.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation of reviewers</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>09.12.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Invitation to authors</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>16.12.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Confirmation of reviewers</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>21.12.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract submission deadline</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>29.1.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.1.2016 (exten.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing of submitted abstracts to review board grouped by topic</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>5.2.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check of abstracts</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>10.2.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing of checked and submitted abstracts to conference organization</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>11.2.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing of checked and submitted abstracts to reviewers</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>12.2.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing (including reminder and extension)</td>
<td>Reviewers</td>
<td>21.2.2016/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.2.2016 (exten.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing of reviewing results to review board</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>26.2.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of accepted abstracts and designation</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>4.3.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing of accepted abstracts and designation to working groups / partner and guest societies</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>6.3.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of titles, session allocation and proposals for chairs</td>
<td>Working groups / partner and guest societies</td>
<td>14.3.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation accepted abstracts, designation, titles and chairs</td>
<td>Scientific committee</td>
<td>15.3.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of chairs</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>17.3.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing of accepted abstracts, designation and titles to conference organization</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>17.3.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing to submitting authors</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>23.3.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation of chairs</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>25.3.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for chairs to accept</td>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>11.4.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of chairs to conference organization</td>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of chairs</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract data to pdf</td>
<td>Conference organization</td>
<td>Approx. 10.05.2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Abstract Guidelines

This information will be provided to potential abstract authors on the internet site, where abstracts are to be submitted.

1. Abstracts may be submitted only via internet. Abstracts submitted via fax or email will not be accepted.
2. **Abstract deadline is Friday, January 29, 2015.**
3. Abstracts must be submitted in English, presentations of accepted abstracts may be held in German, French or English.
4. Your abstract will be printed as submitted.
5. Please make sure that name, email and postal address of corresponding author are complete and correct.
6. Please structure your abstract using the following headings:
   - Introduction
   - Method
   - Results
   - Conclusion
7. Clarity of expression will be considered in the review process. The overall quality of language used should assure comprehension by the reader.
8. The abstract text may not be longer than 2'500 characters (including spaces, excluding authors’ names and title).
9. Abstracts must contain original material neither published nor presented in Switzerland prior to 15 June 2016.
10. There is no limit to the number of abstracts an investigator may submit. Investigators should not submit the same research. Abstracts that appear to be replicate versions of a single study may be rejected.
11. Please limit the number of authors listed to those who have substantially contributed to the abstract. If authors’ names appear on more than one abstract, their names must appear and be spelled identically on each abstract in order to facilitate proper indexing. Wherever possible, do not list authors with initials only. Enter every author’s name into a separate field for indexing. For each author the institution and – if possible – the working group should be declared.
12. Do not use abbreviations in the title. Limit their use to commonly used abbreviations and expand all abbreviations at first mention.
13. No special formats (underline, bold, italic, super-/subscript) may be sued. Instead of the symbols ≤ or ≥ type <= or >=, for superscript like e.g. 10^2 use 10^2, and for subscripts instead of H_2O use H_2O. Avoid complex mathematical formulae. Do not use Greek letters and symbols. For example instead of ‘IFN-γ’ use ‘IFN-gamma’.
14. Tables, charts and other graphics are permitted (max. 2) and must be in JPG or GIF format, of high resolution and in black and white.
15. After having submitted your abstract, you will receive a confirmation by email with
   - Reference number of your abstracts (for inquiry and correspondence purposes)
   - Your personal access code remains valid for future use (e.g. should you wish to edit or correct a submitted abstract, to submit further abstracts to the same or to future conference). Renewed entry of your contact details will be unnecessary. Submitted abstracts may be edited up to the deadline of 29 January 2015.
   - **If you do not receive a confirmation please contact us immediately.**
16. Abstracts will be subject to a blind peer review. Only the review board^5 will be unblinded.
17. The format of presentation will be decided on by the scientific committee based on the quality of the abstracts submitted.
18. Authors will be informed by **End of March 2015 by email** on the decision of the scientific committee (please make sure to state your correct email address). Detailed information on installation and presentation of posters and oral presentations will be

---

^5 Committee of 2 to 4 persons delegated by the board of the SSC to supervise the abstract submission and reviewing process.
mailed directly to authors of accepted abstracts. Submission of an abstract constitutes a commitment by the author(s) to present if accepted. The presenting author should be the submitting author.

19. Abstract authors must register for the conference.

Topics

Please carefully select the topic under which you submit your abstract for review. A review board delegated by the scientific committee will verify the correct allocation of abstracts and may reallocate your abstract prior to the review process if placed incorrectly.

1. Cardiovascular biology
   - Including all abstracts with in vitro or in vivo investigations
2. Pacemaker, Defibrillator and electrophysiology
3. Cardiac failure, valvulopathies, cardiomyopathies, pericardiopathies, heart transplantation
4. Acute Coronary Syndrome (ACS), Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (PCI), Coronary Artery Bypass Graft surgery (CABG)
5. Epidemiology, risk factors, rehabilitation, thromboembolic disease
6. Cardiac imaging, congenital and pediatric cardiology
7. Clinical cases
   - All clinical cases are to be submitted in this topic

Publication

All accepted abstracts will be published in Cardiovascular Medicine, the official journal of the Swiss Society of Cardiology, the Swiss Society for Angiology, the Swiss Society of Hypertension and the Swiss Paediatric Cardiology Society.

Abstract Prizes

In each topic the best abstract(s) will be awarded a prize. The scientific committee wishes to reward mainly younger scientists. Accomplished and experienced scientists are kindly asked to choose the option “Please do not consider my abstract for prize evaluation”.