



**XXXVI  
PAN-AMERICAN CONGRESS  
OF OPHTHALMOLOGY**

MAY 30 - JUNE 2 . 2025. BOGOTA - COLOMBIA



**RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF SCIENTIFIC WORK – POSTER / CLINICAL CASE**

IMPACT EVALUATION	0 points	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	10 points
<b>RELEVANCE</b>	There is no absolute argumentation of the relevance of the case, there is no explanation of the problem that led to the publication of the case, and no discussion of the impact that its publication would have.	The magnitude of the problem is superficially argued. There is no clarity on what led to the publication of the case, and no clarity on the impact that its publication would have.	The nature and magnitude of the problem is clearly argued, but there is not much clarity about the importance of the problem. There is no clarity on the impact the case would have.	There is a clear argument about the nature and magnitude of the problem. There is no clarity on the impact the case would have.	There is a clear argument about the nature and magnitude of the problem. The importance or impact of the clinical case is discussed, however there is no deepening or consistent argumentation of the case.	The nature and magnitude of the main problem is argued with absolute clarity in terms of demonstrating the scientific and social importance of the study in the production of knowledge or its application in the field of ophthalmology. Likewise, there is clarity on the main problem that led to the description of the case, as well as clarity on the impact that its publication would have.
<b>NEW</b>	There is nothing new in relation to the subject treated.	It is a known topic, there is nothing new, however there is an argumentation that makes you think differently about the topic.	It is a case with little novelty; however, the whole context is clearly argued and changes the knowledge about the disease, treatment or complications already known.	It is a somewhat original case, however, there have already been known publications on the subject.	It is an original case, little known, however it is presented superficially, which means that its novelty is not highlighted.	It is an original case, which informs or proposes innovative strategies in the approach to a disease, treatment or complication.
<b>USEFULNESS</b>	There is no use for the case presented.	The usefulness of the case is already known and used, which makes its usefulness very limited.	A useful case is presented, however there is no clarity in its application to ophthalmologic practice.	It is a useful case but it is applied in certain occasions, it is not applied in all similar cases.	A very useful case, with great application but not in the great majority of the cases in which it is presented.	It is a case that is very useful for the development of ophthalmological practice, it allows to clearly propose strategies for when an ophthalmologist faces similar cases.
<b>QUALITY OF INFORMATION</b>	There is no absolute clarity of the sources of information, no citations, no contrast with existing literature, no supporting images or material to complement the information provided.	The sources of information consulted are not reliable and/or are not updated. It does not provide complementary resources (image, graphic, drawing) or they do not add relevant information.	Some of the sources of information consulted are not reliable and/or are not updated. The complementary resources (image, graph, drawing) do not provide relevant information.	Most of the information sources are of quality, reliable and updated. There are no images, tables or drawings to complement the information; or there are but without relevant information.	Most of the information sources are of quality, reliable and updated. Complete with some image, chart or drawing.	All sources are of high quality, reliable and updated. Complete with images, graphs, drawings that provide more information and details to the text.
<b>METHODOLOGICAL EVALUATION</b>	<b>0 points</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>6 points</b>	<b>8 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>
<b>STRUCTURE</b>	It does not have the adequate structure that has been requested	The structure of the work is confusing and makes it difficult to understand the content.	The work has an acceptable structure, although it could improve in the organization of the ideas since it presents repeated ideas, unfinished ideas or disorder in some sections.	The work has an acceptable structure, is understandable and in general has the ideas organized, however it could improve the structure with more information and complementing some concepts and ideas.	The work has a clear and logical structure, facilitating the understanding of the content. However, it lacks some ideas or concepts that could enrich it.	The work has a clear and logical structure, facilitating the understanding of the content.
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	There are no generalities at all about the topic to be addressed, and no context in the current literature.	There is no clarity in the topic to be addressed, there is no generalization or contextualization, there is no problem statement or justification.	The topic is raised in a very superficial way, the contextualization of the state of the art is incomplete and there is no very strong contextualization of the topic in the present time. There is no clarity in the problem statement or justification	there is a good approach to the topic but there is no focus on the case to be presented, good international literature is reviewed but it is not in context with what is presented.	There is a good approach to the topic and its contextualization in relation to what is currently available in the international literature, but there is not much clarity in relation to the context of the current case, its main problem or its justification.	There is a complete approach to the topic in general to be addressed, with a clear contextualization of the current topic. There is clarity regarding the problem statement and justification of the presentation of the case.
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Authors are not listed.		The authors are listed, but there is no institutional information or academic degree.	All authors are referenced with their institutional affiliation and academic degree. There are more than 5 authors in the clinical case		All authors are referenced with their institutional affiliation and academic degree.
<b>CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</b>	Conflicts of interest are not disclosed.					Conflicts of interest are clearly identified and disclosed.
<b>PURPOSE</b>	The purpose is not clear.	The purpose or objective of the study is noted without a main verb, and the objective of what is being proposed is not clear at all.	The purpose is clear, but it is noted with an inadequate verb that is not in accordance with what is proposed or coherent.	The purpose is clear, but is noted with an inadequate verb although it is in accordance and coherent with what is stated.	There is some coherence between the purpose and the content of the work, but they could be better aligned.	The objective is clearly stated with a main verb and clearly contextualized to what is presented in the clinical case. The objective of the work is clearly related to the content presented and is satisfactorily fulfilled.
<b>PRESENTATION OF THE CASE</b>	The clinical case is not presented.	The case is presented in a disordered form. No description of the patient's demographic data. The clinical history is very incomplete.	The case is presented in an orderly form, but there is no detailed description of the patient's demographic data. The clinical history is presented in an unorganized and incomplete manner.	The case is presented in an orderly form, but there is no detailed description of the patient's demographics. The clinical history is presented in a chronological and detailed manner with a complete ophthalmologic examination.	The case is presented in an orderly form. There is detailed description of the patient's demographics. The clinical history is presented chronologically and in detail with a complete ophthalmologic examination. Positive findings (which were present) are noted, however there is no clarity on the negative findings (which were not present) so there is no absolute clarity regarding diagnostic accuracy or differential diagnoses.	The case is presented in an orderly form. There is a detailed description of the patient's demographic data. The clinical history is presented chronologically and in detail with a complete ophthalmologic examination. Both positive (presenting) and negative (non-presenting) findings are noted in order to clarify the diagnostic accuracy as well as to rule out differential diagnoses.
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	No discussion	There is no adequate description of the case in relation to the current literature, and there is an incomplete description of the discussion.	The context of the clinical case is presented in relation to the current literature. There is an approach to diagnostic and therapeutic possibilities, complications or others in relation to the clinical case.	The context of the clinical case is presented in relation to the current literature. There is an approach to diagnostic, therapeutic, complication or other possibilities in relation to the clinical case. The strengths and weaknesses of the case are not explained.	The context of the clinical case is presented in relation to the current literature. There is an approach of diagnostic and therapeutic possibilities, in complications or others in relation to the clinical case. The strengths of the case as well as its weaknesses are explained. A recommendation to be applied in case of a similar case is not explicitly stated.	The context of the clinical case is presented in relation to the current literature. There is an approach of diagnostic and therapeutic possibilities, in complications or others in relation to the clinical case. The strengths of the case as well as its weaknesses are explained. A recommendation to be applied in the case of a similar case is mentioned or explicitly stated.
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	No conclusion	Incomplete and tangential conclusion that does not speak directly and clearly about what was stated in the case.	Conclusion that is not in accordance with what was stated in the clinical case.	A long conclusion that is not clear or concise. There is no clear final lesson.	A short and concise conclusion is stated, but with an unclear "take home" message. It does not describe the main lessons to be learned from the case and consolidates a knowledge that has been provided.	A conclusion is stated that is short and concise, with clear "take home" messages. Describes the main lessons that can be learned from the case and consolidates a knowledge that has been provided.
<b>ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<b>0 points</b>		<b>5 points</b>		<b>10 points</b>	
<b>ETHICAL STATEMENTS</b>	Ethical statements are not presented.		Ethical statements are hinted at but not clearly stated.		Ethical statements are clearly stated.	
<b>DATA MANAGEMENT</b>	Patient data privacy management is not disclosed.		Adherence to patient data privacy law is implied, but not clearly stated.		Adherence to the patient data privacy act is clearly stated (OR not applicable).	
<b>INFORMED CONSENT</b>	Use of informed consent is not specified		It is implied, but the use of informed consent is not clearly specified for the specific case, as well as for publication and disclosure.		The use of informed consent is clearly specified for the specific case, as well as for publication and disclosure.	



XXXVI  
PAN-AMERICAN CONGRESS  
OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

MAY 30 - JUNE 2 . 2025. BOGOTA - COLOMBIA



RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF SCIENTIFIC WORK - FREE PAPER

IMPACT EVALUATION	0 points	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	10 points
<b>RELEVANCE</b>	There is absolutely no argumentation of the relevance of the research. The problem that led to its publication is not explained, and the impact it would have on society is not discussed.	The magnitude of the problem is superficially argued. There is no clarity on what led to the publication of the research, and there is no clarity on the impact that its publication would have.	The nature and magnitude of the problem is clearly argued, but there is not much clarity about the importance of the problem. There is no clarity on the impact of the research.	There is a clear argument about the nature and magnitude of the problem. There is no clarity on the impact of the research.	There is a clear argument about the nature and magnitude of the problem. The importance of the publication is mentioned, however there is no deepening or consistent argumentation of this.	The nature and magnitude of the main problem is argued with absolute clarity in terms of demonstrating the scientific and social importance of the study in the production of knowledge or its application in the field of ophthalmology. There is also clarity on the main problem that led to the research, as well as clarity on the impact that its publication would have.
<b>NEW</b>	There is nothing new in relation to the subject matter.	It is a known topic, there is nothing new, however there is an argumentation that makes you think differently about the topic.	It is a case with little novelty; however, the whole context is clearly argued and changes the knowledge about the disease, treatment or complications already known.	It is a somewhat new topic, however, there have already been known publications on the subject.	It is a new, unusual topic; however, it is presented superficially, which means that its novelty is not highlighted.	It is new research, which informs or proposes innovative strategies for the approach to a disease, treatment, complication or new research proposal that generates new knowledge.
<b>USEFULNESS</b>	There is no usefulness in relation to the proposed research.	The proposed usefulness is already known and used, which makes its relevance very limited.	The work proposed is useful, but there is no clarity in its application to ophthalmologic practice.	It is a useful topic, but it applies in certain occasions, it is not applicable in all similar cases or its results are not inferable.	A very useful topic, with great applicability but not in the great majority of the cases in which it is presented and with limitations when inferring its results.	It is a very useful and important topic for the development of ophthalmologic practice, it allows to propose clear strategies and inferential results for the development of new knowledge.
<b>QUALITY OF INFORMATION</b>	There is no absolute clarity of the sources of information, no citations, no contrast with existing literature, no supporting images or material to complement the information provided.	The sources of information consulted are not reliable and/or are not updated. It does not provide complementary resources (image, graph, drawing) or they do not add relevant information.	Some of the sources of information consulted are not reliable and/or are not updated. The complementary resources (image, graph, drawing) do not provide relevant information.	Most of the information sources are of quality, reliable and updated. There are no images, tables or drawings to complement the information; or there are, but without relevant information.	Most of the information sources are of quality, reliable and updated. Complete with some image, chart or drawing.	All sources are of high quality, reliable and updated. Complete with images, graphs and drawings that provide more information and details to the text.
<b>METHODOLOGICAL EVALUATION</b>	<b>0 points</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>6 points</b>	<b>8 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>
<b>STRUCTURE</b>	It does not have the adequate structure that has been requested	The structure of the work is confusing and makes it difficult to understand the content.	The work has an acceptable structure, although it could improve in the organization of ideas, since it presents repeated ideas, unfinished ideas or disorder in some sections.	The work has an acceptable structure, it is understood and in general has the ideas organized, however it could improve the structure with more information and complementing some concepts and ideas.	The work has a clear and logical structure, facilitating the understanding of the content. However, it lacks some ideas or concepts that could enrich it.	The work has a clear and logical structure, facilitating the understanding of the content.
<b>PURPOSE</b>	The purpose is not clear.	The purpose or objective of the study is noted without a main verb, in addition, the objective of what is proposed is not clear at all.	The purpose is clear, but it is noted with an inadequate verb and is not in accordance with what is proposed or coherent.	The purpose is clear, but it is annotated with an inadequate verb although it is consistent and coherent with what is stated.	There is some coherence between the purpose and the content of the work, but they could be better aligned.	The objective is clearly stated, accompanied by a main verb and clearly contextualized to what is presented in the clinical case. The objective of the work is clearly related to the content presented and is satisfactorily fulfilled.
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	There are no generalities at all about the topic to be addressed, or its current context in the literature.	There is no clarity in the topic to be addressed, there is no generalization or contextualization, there is no problem statement or justification.	The topic is approached in a very superficial manner, the contextualization of the state of the art is incomplete and there is no very strong contextualization of the topic at present. there is no clarity in the problem statement or justification.	There is a good approach to the topic but there is no focus on the case to be presented, good international literature is reviewed but it is not in context with what is presented.	There is a good approach to the topic and its contextualization in relation to what is currently available in the international literature, but there is not much clarity in relation to the context of the current case, its main problem or its justification.	There is a complete approach to the topic in general to be addressed, with a clear contextualization of the current topic. There is clarity regarding the problem statement and justification of the presentation of the case.
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Authors are not listed.		Authors are listed, but there is no institutional information or academic degree.	All authors are referenced with their institutional affiliation and academic degree. The participation of all authors is not clear.		All authors are referenced with their institutional affiliation and academic degree and their participation in the work.
<b>CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</b>	Conflicts of interest are not noted.					Conflicts of interest are clearly noted and declared.
<b>METHOD</b>	Methodology absent.	Methodology unclear, if I wanted to reproduce it would be impossible due to lack of information.	Steps are specified in the methodology, however, there is no clear structure of the methodology, or it lacks replicability, it is not an adequate methodology or one that allows inference of the study, it does not clarify biases or how they were controlled.	Structured methodology, but lacks methodological quality, there is no clarity in the type of study. Likewise, it is not consistent with the sampling or the sample, there is no clear scientific method despite being a partially complete methodology.	The sections are specified, there is clarity regarding the unit of analysis or subjects, there is clarity regarding data collection, there is specification of follow-up, biases are stated, there is evidence of statistical analysis. However, some information is lacking, which generates the sensation of an incomplete methodology.	Methodology is clear and structured. The population, sample and sampling, type of study are stated and also the data collection and scientific method used is concordant, there is clarity in the follow-up, the biases are stated, there is clarity in the step by step, there is evidence of the statistical analysis. if the methodology were a recipe, it is clearly explained to the point that anyone can reproduce it.
<b>RESULTS</b>	Results are not presented.	Results are presented in a non-organized way; they do not respond to the research objective.	The results are presented in a disorderly manner, the research question is answered, however there is no absolute clarity, and it is confused with other data presented.	The results are presented in an orderly manner, but do not clearly answer the research question.	The results are presented in an orderly manner. There is a detailed description of the data, the research question is answered, however, interpretations are made in this section (there should not be any) or they are written in an unclear or inadequate manner for the type of work.	The results are presented in an orderly manner, clearly answering the research question, there are images and tables that support them, giving absolute clarity to the results. There are no interpretations or data that should not be included in this section.
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	No discussion.	There is no adequate description of the topic in relation to the current literature, there is an incomplete description of the discussion.	The context of the subject case is presented in relation to the current literature. There is an incomplete approach to diagnostic and therapeutic possibilities, current relevance or applicability of the topic.	The context of the case is presented in relation to the current literature. There is an approach of diagnostic, therapeutic possibilities, current relevance or applicability to the topic. The strengths and weaknesses of the topic are not explained.	The context of the topic is presented in relation to the current literature. There is an approach of diagnostic and therapeutic possibilities, in complications or others in relation to the clinical case. The strengths of the topic as well as its weaknesses are explained. There is no explicit recommendation or current implementation of the topic, and there is no data that contribute or are useful and give relevance to the research.	The context of the clinical topic is presented in relation to the current literature. There is an approach of diagnostic, therapeutic possibilities, or applicability of the topic. The strengths of the case as well as its weaknesses are explained. Future recommendations, additional possibilities or hypotheses or findings that provide relevance and applicability to the research are explicitly stated or suggested.
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	No conclusion.	Incomplete and tangential conclusion that does not speak directly and clearly about what was stated in the case.	Conclusion that is not in accordance with what was stated in the clinical case.	A long conclusion that is not clear or concise. There is no clear final lesson.	A short and concise conclusion is stated, but with an unclear "take home" message. It does not describe the main lessons to be learned from the case and consolidates a knowledge that has been provided.	A conclusion is stated that is short and concise, with clear "take home" messages. Describes the main lessons that can be learned from the case and consolidates a knowledge that has been provided.
<b>ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<b>0 points</b>		<b>5 points</b>		<b>10 points</b>	
<b>ETHICAL STATEMENTS</b>	Ethical statements are not presented.		Ethical statements are hinted at but not clearly stated.		Ethical statements are clearly stated.	
<b>DATA MANAGEMENT</b>	Patient data privacy management is not disclosed.		Adherence to patient data privacy law is implied, but not clearly stated.		Adherence to the patient data privacy act is clearly stated (OR not applicable).	
<b>INFORMED CONSENT</b>	Use of informed consent is not specified.		It is implied, but the use of informed consent is not clearly specified for the specific case, as well as for publication and disclosure.		The use of informed consent is clearly specified for the specific case, as well as for publication and disclosure.	



**XXXVI  
PAN-AMERICAN CONGRESS  
OF OPHTHALMOLOGY**

MAY 30 - JUNE 2 . 2025. BOGOTA - COLOMBIA



**RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF SCIENTIFIC WORK – SCIENTIFIC VIDEO**

	<b>2 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>6 points</b>	<b>8 points</b>
<b>QUALITY</b>	The video does not present sufficient quality.	There are some mistakes that affect the quality: in the focus or in the sound, but the quality is sufficient.	The quality of the video, focus and sound is good in most of the video.	The video and focus quality is excellent for all parts of the video, as well as the sound.
<b>INTEREST</b>	The video does not have a variety of effects.	There is little variety in shots, angles and/or sound effects.	Uses different camera angles and/or shots. Includes sound effects, but they are not of good quality.	Uses different camera angles and/or shots. Includes sound effects. The visual and sound effects in the video are varied and correct.
<b>CONTEXT</b>	There is no contextualization of the video	The video is understood and manages to generate implicit contextualization, but there is no explicit contextualization.	There is clear contextualization, introduction that contextualizes but is not congruent with what is shown.	There is a context, an introduction and it is consistent with what is shown.
<b>TEXT</b>	No text.	Supporting text is unclear or incomplete or with many errors.	Has supporting text, but not enough to give clarity to everything and contains errors.	The text gives clarity to the events that happen in the video and is a great ally of the video.
<b>CONTENT</b>	Content with errors and mistakes that do not allow for clarity.	Incomplete content with poor visualization or that do not give clarity of what is happening.	Clear content, clearly and visually informs everything that is happening; however, it has errors in its shots or in some steps that make it lose continuity.	Clear content, clear images and clearly detailed chronology, a quality and explicit content.
<b>ORIGINALITY</b>	Uses other people's ideas, but does not give credit to them.	Uses other people's ideas (giving them credit), but there is almost no evidence of original ideas.	The product demonstrates some originality. Work demonstrates use of new ideas and insight.	The product demonstrates great originality. Ideas are creative and clever.
<b>DURATION</b>	The video runs long in the maximum time allowed (3 minute) or takes up very little time.			The video is within the time limit
<b>RELEVANCE</b>	There is no innovation compared to the technique or video presented.	It is not a very new topic; however, it is adequately presented and generates interest and possibility in its application, it generates some new ideas.	It is a somewhat new topic, however, there are already many known publications on the subject, it contributes new ideas.	It is an innovative, informative and clear video, which highlights relevant information that can be used and applied by a peer.



**XXXVI  
PAN-AMERICAN CONGRESS  
OF OPHTHALMOLOGY**

MAY 30 - JUNE 2 . 2025. BOGOTA - COLOMBIA



**RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF ORAL PRESENTATIONS – FREE PAPERS**

	<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>	<b>7 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>
<b>GENERAL PRESENTATION OF THE TOPIC</b>	No presentation of the topic.	Presentation of the topic in a non-organized way, it is not clear about the main ideas.	Although it is a complete presentation, there is order in parts of the talk, but in other moments there is no clarity in the topics presented.	The topic is presented in an organized manner, there are ideas that are not clear or resolved, there is a certain confidence in the presentation.	Presentation of the topic organized, concise, the ideas are very clear, there is concordance between the objective of the talk and what the presenter indicates, there is security of the information.
<b>MANAGEMENT OF THE STAGE</b>	No stage management.	There is constant nervousness, no good stage management, does not look at the audience, continually looks at the presentation, insecure.	Handles the topic, there is calm on the stage, insecure at times, stays in one spot, no interaction with the audience.	Handles the subject matter, there is calm on stage, stays in one spot, handles ideas well and interacts with the audience.	Demonstrates security regarding the topic, handling the stage properly, moves around the stage, shows security in his handling, interacts with the audience.
<b>SLIDES</b>	No slides.	More than 12 slides, inadequate colors, no good contrast, not easy to read, inadequate font size.	More than 12 slides, good font size, order and good contrast, esthetically adequate.	It is limited to 12 slides, the aesthetics of the slides is not adequate, colors and contrast that make them difficult to read or inadequate font size.	The presentation is limited to a maximum of 12 slides, with good font size, good contrast and adequate appearance. They are easy to read.
<b>QUESTIONS</b>	No response to questions	No clear answer to the questions, insecure in the answers.	Answers some questions, with some insecurity about them.	Answers the questions, there is certainty in the topic, gives redundant answers, long and without clear precision.	Answers the questions completely with certainty, leaving a precise and convincing answer.
<b>TIME MANAGEMENT</b>	No good time management, ends the topic later than expected and must be interrupted to end the presentation.		Ends the topic well ahead of time.		Ends on time or just ahead of time completely and gives space for questions.