

## JUDGING in RAD APPLICATION

Please alert your judging coordinator if there is a conflict of interest. [Click Here](#)

Hello, Register!

**Filter**

**Number:** 201

Bone Targeted Polymeric Nanoparticles for Metastatic Prostate Cancer

**Presenters:** Andrew Gdowski

**Total Score:** 0

View Abstract – Takes you to the Digital Commons site where you can read the text of the abstract submission.

Begin – Begin the judging process

Conflict – Report a conflict of interest. If you are a part of the research process with this student in any way, please report that. Check with your judging coordinator with any questions.

[Welcome, Register](#) [Logout](#)

[Return Home](#)

[Abstract List](#)

[Hypothesis and/or Statement of Problem](#)

[Results](#)

**Title:** Bone Targeted Polymeric Nanoparticles for Metastatic Prostate Cancer

**Author(s):** Andrew Gdowski, Amalendu Ranjan, Jamboor Vishwanatha

**Presenter(s):** Andrew Gdowski **Abstract Number:** 201

**Hypothesis and/or Statement of Problem**

1

The hypothesis/statement was inappropriate or was missing. There was little or no background information and the goal of the project was not stated.

2

A questionable hypothesis/statement of problem was not presented and was not necessarily supported. Some relevant background information was included, but not connected. Goal of project was not clear.

3

A questionable hypothesis/statement of problem was presented. Background information was relevant, but connections were not made. Goal of project was stated understandably.

4

A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented. Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear. Goal of project was stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project.

5

A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented clearly. Background information relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. Goal of project.

**Show/Hide Comments for the Hypothesis and/or Statement of Problem Category**

Save

Comments (Optional)

[Next Category](#)

The judge will select a score based on the rubric provided. There is an area for the judge to make comments as well. When all sections of the rubric are finished, a summary page is produced.

<b>Title:</b>	Bone Targeted Polymeric Nanoparticles for Metastatic Prostate Cancer		
<b>Author(s):</b>	Andrew Gdowski, Amalendu Ranjan, Jamboor Vishwanatha		
<b>Presenter(s):</b>	Andrew Gdowski	<b>Abstract Number:</b>	201

## Rubric Summary

<b>Category:</b> Results	
<b>Description:</b> no discussion of choice of methods. Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some appropriate controls or groups were missing. Little comment on why the methods were chosen and other	
<b>Comments:</b>	
<b>Score:</b> 2	
<b>Category:</b> Hypothesis and/or Statement of Problem	
<b>Description:</b> logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented. Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear. Goal of project was stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project.	
<b>Comments:</b>	
<b>Score:</b> 4	
<b>Total Score:</b> 6	<b>Status:</b> Complete

A judge can go in and edit their score BEFORE the expiration time.

When all abstracts are listed as “COMPLETE” the judge is finished scoring their abstracts.