<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical*</th>
<th>Basic Science</th>
<th>Health Services Research</th>
<th>ORL Status and Trends</th>
<th>Technology/Procedure Development</th>
<th>Historical Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**GENERAL CRITERIA**  
MAX = 9 POINTS Point scale for each criterion  
0 = absent  
1 = adequate  
2 = exceptional

- Hypothesis/objectives  
- Focused background/review  
- Statement of type of project  
- Clearly written  
- Adherence to format & structure guidelines
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- Rationale  
- Objectives  
- Statement of type of project  
- Clearly written  
- Adherence to format guidelines

**METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH AND CONCLUSIONS**  
MAX = 27 POINTS Point scale for each criterion  
0-1 = absent/minimal  
2-3 = adequate  
4-5 = exceptional

- Strategy & methods clear & appropriate to accomplish objectives  
- IRB approval if necessary (0 or 2)  
- **Appropriate** statistical analysis  
- Appropriate figures and tables  
- Discussion supports research results & relevance to clinical application
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- Appropriate statistical analysis  
- Appropriate figures and tables  
- Discussion supports research results & relevance to clinical application

- Identification of contemporary issue  
- Comprehensive and comparative analysis of current status  
- Method & approach clearly presented  
- Appropriate supportive figures and tables  
- Relevance to status and practice discussed & supported by analysis

- Strategy & methods clear & appropriate to accomplish objectives  
- IRB/IACUC approval if necessary  
- Appropriate analysis  
- Appropriate figures and tables  
- Application and improvement of clinical methods supported by comparative data

- Historical evolution to current status/objective  
- Role in development of contemporary ORL practice  
- Figures/graphics as appropriate  
- Creativity and innovation of presentation  
- Relevance to current state of knowledge supported by chronology

**OVERALL IMPACT**  
MAX = 24 POINTS  
0-3 = absent/minimal  
4-6 = adequate  
7-8 = exceptional/outstanding

- Significance  
- Innovation  
- Contribution
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THESIS CATEGORIES AND REVIEWER GUIDELINES (2 of 2 pages)

**General Criteria.** All theses will adhere to general standards as published by the Triological Society

- Adherence to all format requirements: page, length, structure, components (as appropriate to category)
- Maintenance of anonymity in presentation
- Absence of major deficiencies, errors, omissions
- Clear of any non-disclosed conflicts of interest
- Original project

**Overall Impact. Max Score = 24**

Reviewers will provide an overall impact/priority score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on otolaryngology – head and neck surgery, in consideration of the following broad review criteria, and additional review criteria (as applicable for the project category proposed).

- **Significance:** Will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? Can this project potentially influence the concepts, methods, technologies, preparation and training, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field? Was a question or gap in knowledge answered, clarified, or resolved?

- **Innovation.** Does the project challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed as an original project? Does the project offer new insights into the development of the principles and practice of otolaryngology – head and neck surgery or its place in the history of medicine?

- **Contribution.** Does the project demonstrate ways in which the principles and practice of otolaryngology – head and neck surgery can be used to improve medicine and/or society? Does the project contribute to the body of knowledge in ways that are consistent with the highest ideals and mission of the Triological Society and its place in the specialty?

Total Maximum score = 60 points (varies slightly by category)