



OFFICIAL DOCUMENT

# General Rules and Guidelines for Abstract Submission

---

**ISA Santiago 2027**

21st International Symposium on Atherosclerosis

**October 20 - 22, 2027**

Santiago, Chile

Organized by: International Atherosclerosis Society (IAS) · AterosChile

Produced by: Eventual Latam

# General Rules and Guidelines for Abstract Submission

ISA Santiago 2027 · 21st International Symposium on Atherosclerosis

Abstract submission deadline: April 15, 2027, at 23:59 hrs (local time). A maximum extension period of 15 days is contemplated, until April 30, 2027.

The Scientific Committee of the Congress will accept for review the abstracts that meet the following requirements:

1. The scientific work or clinical case report must constitute a contribution to the fields of knowledge in atherosclerosis and/or its associated cardiovascular and metabolic diseases.
2. Studies must have approval from the Ethics Committee or equivalent regulatory body of the institution in charge of the clinical research.
3. Only abstracts submitted through the official congress platform will be accepted. Submissions sent through any other channel will not be considered.
4. The work must be of original authorship and must not have been previously accepted or presented at related congresses prior to the date of this congress.
5. The official language of the Congress is English. Therefore, every abstract and presentation must be prepared in English.
6. If the work is accepted, the first author and/or presenter must be registered for the congress prior to its start. At the time of submission, the person responsible for presenting the work must be indicated.
7. Submission of the abstract implies full acceptance of these requirements. The decision of the Scientific Committee is final and not subject to appeal. The organization may reject any work that does not comply with these rules or does not meet the minimum acceptance score, and will issue a notice to the first author explaining the reason for rejection.

## Submission content and format

During the submission period, an online form will be enabled on the ISA Santiago 2027 · 21st International Symposium on Atherosclerosis website, allowing direct submission of the abstract to the Scientific Committee.

At the time of submission, the author must select and indicate the area in which the work should be presented:

- Clinical studies
- Basic research
- Clinical case reports
- Systematic reviews

Annexes 1, 2 and 3 include a detailed description of the possible contents of each area and their evaluation criteria.

At the time of submission, the author must indicate whether they prefer oral or poster presentation. However, the final decision on the modality lies with the Scientific Committee.

There is no limit on the number of works that can be submitted per author.

## Abstract Specifications

### Title and Authors

---

**Title:** must be written in capital letters. Maximum 25 words and relevant to the work.

**Authors:** the author list must be restricted to those who actually carried out the study, participating in its planning, design, data collection, analysis of results, and preparation of the work. All authors must appear with: first name, paternal surname and maternal surname. Following each name, the academic or healthcare institution(s) involved must be indicated through a superscript number.

### Body of the Abstract

It must include the following content:

- Introduction
- Objective(s)
- Methodology: for Clinical Studies, Basic Science Studies or Systematic Reviews, the type of study, materials/methods and statistical analysis must be specified. Not applicable to Clinical Cases.
- Results or Description of Clinical Cases: brief description of the most relevant findings. May be supported by a table or figure.
- Conclusions: limited to those drawn from the results.
- Funding: any type of financial support or financial relationship/conflict of interest of the authors must be disclosed.

### Considerations

- Do not write the names of the authors in the body of the abstract, nor any information that may indicate the institutional origin of the work, in order to preserve the blinding of the evaluation. Failure to comply will be penalized with a 1-point reduction from the final score.
- Do not include bibliographic references.
- Do not include videos.
- Do not use commercial drug names. Only the active ingredient should be used.
- The text must be a maximum of 2,500 characters, excluding the title and including content of any table or figure.
- Standardized and well-known abbreviations may be used. When specific or unusual abbreviations are used, they must be placed in parentheses after the complete term the first time they appear.
- Failure to comply with these rules will result in a percentage deduction from the total score.

## Review, selection and acceptance of works

---

1. Abstracts will be received until April 15, 2027, at 23:59 hrs (local time). A maximum extension period of 15 days is contemplated, until April 30, 2027.
2. Notification of acceptance or rejection will be sent by e-mail to the authors on June 15, 2027, and the day and time of the presentation will subsequently be communicated. The deadline for receiving the accepted abstracts (final version) will be August 15, 2027.
3. Each abstract will be evaluated independently by members of the Scientific Committee, who will assign an individual score considering the originality, technical and scientific merit of the work. A previously defined rubric (annexes 1, 2 and 3) will be used, specifically designed for each research area. Based on the final score and interest, it will be decided whether the work is accepted and the modality of presentation: oral or poster. The Committee, together with an evaluation commission, will select the winning works following the oral presentation and discussion, based on the average of the written abstract rubric and the oral presentation rubric (annex 4), to compete for a cash prize in US dollars.

---

## Presentation of selected works

---

The presentation modalities are:

1. Oral presentation: consists of an in-person presentation of 5 minutes, plus 3 minutes for discussion.
2. Poster: requested in digital PPT format, presented in person during the poster session.
3. When presenting the work, results or conclusions derived from experiments not described in the abstract must not be incorporated. Only data directly mentioned and developed in the abstract text may be reported.

---

## Best Abstract Awards

---

ISA 2027, through the Scientific Committee, will award the three best works under one of the two following modalities, depending on the number of works received in each established category.

- If at least 3 works compete in each of the categories, ONE winning work will be selected in each of the three categories.
- If fewer than 3 works compete in any category, the three categories will compete among themselves for first, second and third place.

Regarding the prizes, if the 3 categories are awarded, US\$500 will be granted to the best work in each of the 3 categories.

If a single competition is defined that includes all 3 categories, the first prize will be US\$600, second prize US\$400, and third prize US\$200. The possibility of any prize being declared vacant is considered. In both cases, the Scientific Committee evaluation panel may grant honorable mentions to other works that stand out in their content and presentation.

## Description: Basic Sciences

All knowledge whose objective is to support the foundations of clinical medicine and that is not applicable in the short term.

Includes works conducted in: animal models, cell lines or in vitro studies. May include studies on:

- Drugs or metabolites in animal models.
- Genetic studies that are not clinical cases.
- MicroRNA or coding RNA.
- Regulation of metabolic pathways. Enzymes.

### Evaluation rubric for “Basic Sciences” works — ISA 2027 Scientific Committee

Criterion	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Absent (0)	Score
<b>INTRODUCTION (5%)</b>	Clearly connects the literature with the problem being addressed.	Attempts to connect the literature with the work but is unclear.	No connection between the literature and the work.	Absent.		
<b>OBJECTIVES (10%)</b>	Poses a clear, concise and relevant research question.	Research question is present but unclear or poorly structured.	Research question does not correlate with the study being carried out.	Absent.		
<b>MATERIALS, METHODS AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS (20%)</b>	Clear. Identifies appropriate materials and methods to address the objective.	Unclear or not connected to the objective.	Not stated, but implicit.	Absent.		
<b>RESULTS (15%)</b>	Clear, connected to the objective; explains findings.	Unclear or incomplete.	Unclear, incomplete, and not related to the objective.	Absent.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS (20%)</b>	Clear, concise, consistent with the results and responsive to the objective.	Clear but the interpretation is doubtful. Partial connection with the objective.	Unclear or inadequate interpretation, with no connection to the objective.	Absent.		
<b>ORIGINALITY / CONTRIBUTION (30%)</b>	Provides novel and relevant information.	Relevant information, minor contribution to knowledge.	Unclear, underdeveloped.	Not original nor a contribution to knowledge.		

Criterion	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Absent (0)	Score
<b>Final score</b>						

*\*Materials and methods refers to the description of the scope or setting of the study, description of subjects and/or participants, study design, variables, and the instrument or method used to obtain data.*

*\*Data analysis with a description of the process and method must also be included.*

## Description: Clinical Studies and Systematic Reviews

A clinical study is an experimental evaluation of a product, substance, drug, diagnostic or therapeutic technique that, when applied to human subjects, seeks to assess its efficacy and safety.

A systematic review is a rigorous synthesis of evidence based on an explicit and reproducible protocol that guides the search, selection and critical evaluation of studies. This approach minimizes bias and allows reliable conclusions about a specific question.

### Evaluation rubric for Clinical Studies and Systematic Reviews — ISA 2027 Scientific Committee

Criterion	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Absent (0)	Score
<b>INTRODUCTION (5%)</b>	Clearly connects the literature with the problem being addressed.	Attempts to connect the literature with the work but is unclear.	No connection between the literature and the work.	Absent.		
<b>OBJECTIVES (10%)</b>	Poses a clear, concise and relevant research question.	Research question is present but unclear or poorly structured.	Research question does not correlate with the study being carried out.	Absent.		
<b>MATERIALS, METHODS AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS (20%)</b>	Clear. Identifies appropriate materials and methods to address the objective.	Unclear or not connected to the objective.	Not stated, but implicit.	Absent.		
<b>RESULTS (15%)</b>	Clear, connected to the objective; explains findings.	Unclear or incomplete.	Unclear, incomplete, and not related to the objective.	Absent.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS (20%)</b>	Clear, concise, consistent with the results and responsive to the objective.	Clear but the interpretation is doubtful. Partial connection with the objective.	Unclear or inadequate interpretation, with no connection to the objective.	Absent.		
<b>ORIGINALITY / CONTRIBUTION (30%)</b>	Provides novel and relevant information.	Relevant information, minor contribution to knowledge.	Unclear, underdeveloped.	Not original nor a contribution to knowledge.		
<b>Final score</b>						

*\*Materials and methods refers to the description of the scope or setting of the study, description of subjects and/or participants, study design, variables, and the instrument or method used to obtain data.*

*\*Data analysis with a description of the process and method must also be included.*

## Description: Clinical Case Reports

A clinical case report is defined as a clinical picture, usually in a single patient (up to 3 patients), of infrequent clinical presentation or that presents difficulty in its diagnosis or treatment, if relevant, or that shows an unusual evolution.

### Evaluation rubric for Clinical Case Reports — ISA 2027 Scientific Committee

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Score
<b>ORIGINALITY AND RELEVANCE OF THE CASE (40%)</b>	Fully provides innovation in the approach to the case and a relevant contribution to its resolution by the investigator.	Adequately provides innovation in the approach to the case or relevant information for its resolution by the investigator.	Meets only one of the two criteria: provides innovation in the approach to the case, or a relevant contribution to its resolution by the investigator.	Does not provide innovation in the approach to the case nor a relevant contribution to its resolution by the investigator.	
<b>Final Score</b>					

## Evaluation rubric: Oral presentation of scientific works

Category	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points	Score
<b>1. Content</b> Basic Sciences, Clinical Studies and Systematic Reviews: -Introduction / - Objectives / - Materials and Methods / -Results / -Conclusions Clinical Case Reports: -Introduction / - Case description / - Discussion and analysis / -Originality and relevance of the case.	Complete presentation, with all the essential elements of a scientific work, consistent with the abstract submitted to the Scientific Committee.	Most (around 80%) of the essential elements are adequately covered.	Some (around 50%) essential elements are adequately covered.	Lack of relevant content in several aspects (around 30%).	Content absent or incoherent.	
<b>2. Structure of the presentation</b>	The presentation follows a clear and logical structure throughout.	The presentation follows a clear and logical structure most of the time.	The structure of the presentation is confusing at some points.	Lack of clear and coherent structure in the presentation.	The structure of the presentation is chaotic and not understandable.	
<b>3. Clarity and organization</b>	All concepts are presented in a clear and organized manner.	Most concepts are presented in a clear and organized manner.	Some concepts are unclear or disorganized.	Concepts are confusing and disorganized at several points.	The presentation is incomprehensible and disorganized.	
<b>4. Communication skills</b>	The presenter communicates effectively, fluently and with clear pronunciation	Communication is mostly effective, with only a few areas for improvement.	Some communication difficulties, but generally understandable.	Communication is deficient and hinders understanding.	Communication is so poor that it	

Category	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points	Score
	, using appropriate language.				is almost impossible to understand.	
<b>5. Use of visual aids (if applicable)</b>	Visual aids are effective, relevant and enhance understanding .	Visual aids are mostly effective, with some areas for improvement.	Visual aids are relevant but could be clearer.	Visual aids are confusing and do not contribute significantly.	Visual aids are ineffective or absent.	
<b>6. Responses to questions</b>	The presenter responds effectively and with well-founded answers to all questions in depth and with precision.	The presenter responds to most questions appropriately.	Answers are partial or confusing at some points.	Answers are inadequate and lack depth.	The presenter is unable to respond to the questions effectively.	
					<b>Total</b>	