



# 2025 BMES CMBE Conference

"Cell Engineering for Mechanomedicine and Rejuvenation"

January 3-6, 2025

Cape Rey Carlsbad Beach Hilton | Carlsbad, CA



**Post-Doc Travel Award Eligibility: Applicants must have had an independent lab for no more than 6 years at the time of application. Abstracts should present work from the applicant's independent lab.**

## Significance

Criteria	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores	Max Score	Assigned Score
<p>Scores should reflect the importance of the <b>work presented in the abstract</b>, with respect to the relevant literature and the work's impact to the field of CMBE. Studies providing mechanistic insight, developing new technologies, and/or enabling translational activities are of particular interest</p>	<p>5: Reveals long sought-after mechanism / Presents ground-breaking technology / Describes translational approach to major clinical need / Other equivalent accomplishment</p> <p>4: Reveals important mechanism / Presents exciting new technology / Describes translational approach to minor clinical need / Other equivalent accomplishment</p> <p>3: Refines well-studied mechanism / Present a new technology/ Refines existing translational approach / Other equivalent accomplishment</p> <p>2: Focuses on technical details or approaches of some interest to the CMBE field</p> <p>1: Focuses on technical details or approaches largely not of general interest to the CMBE field</p>	5	

## Innovation

Criteria	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores	Max Score	Assigned Score
<p>Scores should reflect the overall conceptual and/or technical innovation the <b>work presented in abstract</b> with respect to current approaches in CMBE. Approaches enabling studies in new sub-fields of CMBE, probing new scales/concepts in existing sub-fields, or integrating diverse sub-fields are of particular interest</p>	<p>5: Study opens new sub-field, probes existing sub-field in new way, integrates multiple subfields for the first time, and/or other equivalent characteristic</p> <p>4: One of first studies in new sub-field, using new techniques, integrating multiple sub-fields, and/or other equivalent characteristic</p> <p>3: Focuses on an established field of research</p> <p>2: A confirmative study using novel approaches</p> <p>1: Largely a confirmative study using established techniques</p>	5	

## Technical Content

Criteria	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores	Max Score	Assigned Score
<p>Presented results are quantitative, clearly, and concisely summarized, sufficiently powered, potentially repeatable, and appropriately interpreted</p>	<p>5: All aspects of technical content are high quality</p> <p>4: Most aspects of technical content are high quality</p> <p>3: Some aspects of technical content are high quality</p> <p>2: Few aspects of technical content are high quality</p> <p>1: Very few aspects of technical content are high quality</p>	5	

## Writing Style and Figure Presentation

Criteria	Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores	Max Score	Assigned Score
<p>Writing style is high quality: lacking excessive technical jargon, is clear and concise, has a logical flow, lacks typos, and communicates main points effectively. Figures are of high quality, easily read, and readily convey important aspects of data</p>	<p>5: All aspects of writing and figures are high quality</p> <p>4: Most aspects of writing and figures are high quality</p> <p>3: Some aspects of writing and figures are high quality</p> <p>2: Few aspects of writing and figures are high quality</p> <p>1: Very few aspects of writing and figures are high quality</p>	5	

<b>Investigator</b>			
<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Example Characteristics and Suggested Scores</u>	<u>Max Score</u>	<u>Assigned Score</u>
Productivity of the investigator, <b><u>based on career stage, standards of pertinent CMBE sub-field, and in reference to the biosketch.</u></b>	5: Exceptional productivity, 4: Outstanding Productivity, 3: Good Productivity, 2: Average Productivity, 1: Weak Productivity	5	
Impact of the investigator's entire body of work, <b><u>based on career stage and in reference to the biosketch.</u></b>	5: Exceptional Impact, 4: Outstanding Impact, 3: Good Impact, 2: Average Impact, 1: Less than Average Impact	5	
Overall investigator score: This score should reflect the overall quality of the investigator's <b><u>entire body of work based on career stage and in reference to the biosketch.</u></b> As this is a research award, primary emphasis should be placed on research achievements. Secondly, other contributions, such as those to education and service, may be considered. <b><u>Applicants may alter their biosketch from strict NIH/NSF guidelines to highlight key contributions.</u></b>	5: Exceptional Body of Work, 4: Outstanding Body of Work, 3: Good Body of Work, 2: Average Body of Work, 1: Less than Average Body of Work	5	

<b>Overall Score of Application</b>			
<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Reviewer Comments, Score Driving Factors</u>	<u>Max Score</u>	<u>Assigned Score</u>
The overall application score should represent the overall quality of the application as subject to the opinion of the reviewer in response to a holistic review of the entire application.		5	

<b>Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity</b>			
<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Explanation</u>	<u>Max Score</u>	<u>Assigned Score</u>
A major goal of the CMBE SIG is to support and promote a vibrant, diverse, equitable and inclusive research community. In your opinion, will the applicant contribute to a fuller representation of perspectives within the CMBE SIG? This is intended to be a holistic assessment that considers any of a broad range of factors that could be relevant to CMBE, including, but not limited to, demonstrated leadership, resilience/persistence, background, life experience, culture, race, ethnicity, work, and dedicated to projects or causes. <b><u>Applicants are encouraged alter their biosketch from strict NIH/NSF guidelines to highlight relevant factors, if they wish.</u></b>		Y/N?	