

Guidelines for the
International Society for
Applied Ethology
(ISAE)



International
Society for
**Applied
Ethology**

December 2017

Next revision due September 2018

Appendix II: Abstract Submission Standard

The LCOC must ensure that the following information is available to prospective authors (however, much of this may be covered by abstract handling with Wageningen Academic Publishers):

- Abstracts must present information that falls within the scope of the ISAE.
- Abstracts presenting both theoretical and empirical work related to applied ethology will be considered for presentation at the ISAE Congress.
- Abstracts must not exceed 3000 keystrokes in length, excluding title, names and affiliation, with the exception of abstracts for potential plenary papers, which should be 2 to 3 pages in length. However, a shorter abstract for plenary papers may be published in the proceedings to avoid the possibility that it may be regarded by some publishers, as 'published previously'.
- The first name of authors, not just initials, should be given.
- Abstracts must contain a clear statement of the purpose of the work, the methods used, the results, and conclusions. Results should be presented in sufficient detail to support the conclusions drawn. Except for theoretical contributions and review papers (such as plenary papers), submitted abstracts must contain data, indicate the method(s) of analysis, and provide information about test statistics.
- Reviewers will be advised to reject empirical abstracts that do not contain data, since it is very difficult to evaluate the suitability of these abstracts for presentation.
- Although authors may submit multiple abstracts, each presenting author may present only one spoken paper, or one poster (not both a paper and a poster). Therefore, the Local Congress Organising Committee will accept only one if an author submits multiple abstracts as the presenting author.
- The required formatting and layout of the abstract (the use of a template should be considered) including how references should be given; ordinarily references are not cited in abstracts, however, if given, they should be placed in the text of the abstract in the following format: (Jones & Swanson, Appl. Anim. Ethol. 14:23, 1980).
- A statement by which authors must confirm that the work described in the abstract conforms with the ISAE [Ethical Guidelines](#) (see [Appendix III](#)).
- A checklist of potential ethical issues associated with the work reported in the submitted abstract (see [Appendix III](#) for details).

- A place where authors can provide additional information about their work in case it involves ethical issues (see [Appendix III](#) for details of the information that authors should provide).
- A place where authors can indicate whether they wish their presentation to be considered for the student presentation competition.
- A place where authors can nominate their preferred form of presentation of their work (e.g. plenary paper, short oral paper, or poster).

Appendix III: Guide for Reviewers of Abstracts

Reviewers are requested:

- a) To be brief and succinct in their feedback
- b) To make suggestions that improve English and comprehension
- c) To check the following:
 - Abstracts are approximately 3000 keystrokes or fewer in length (the Local Congress Organising Committee will check exact numbers).
 - They contain the aim of the work, methods, results and conclusions.
 - That data are given (unless the paper is a review or totally theoretical) together with method of data analysis and information on test statistics.
 - That the conclusions are consistent with the results.
 - **Any potential ethical issues.** The ISAE Ethics Committee has constructed a brief checklist of some relevant welfare or ethical issues. If any of these have occurred as part of the experimental design of the study being reviewed then the justification should be apparent. If it is not, the reviewer may wish to consult with the Ethics Committee or recommend that the Ethics Committee reviews the paper. Further information is available in the ISAE Ethics Guidelines <http://www.applied-ethology.org/ethicalguidelines.htm>. Reviewers should indicate on a scale of 0 to 4 (0 = no ethical concern whatsoever and 4 = major ethical concerns) their overall ethical concern about the study reported. Abstracts scoring 3 or 4 will automatically be forwarded to the Ethics Committee, whilst a decision on those scoring 1 or 2 would be at the discretion of the Local Congress Organising Committee. Referees should indicate overall if they feel the abstract should be seen by the Ethics Committee, even if the abstract has a low ethical score. To assist with making a decision, reviewers should consider the following:

As part of the experimental design, did the study impose any of the following procedures or conditions?

- Housing or husbandry inappropriate for the psychological and physiological needs of the species being studied
- Staged aggression, competition, or social defeat
- Protracted food or water deprivation, or diet manipulations likely to have an adverse effect on the animals
- Mutilations (this can include some methods of permanent marking, e.g. toe or tail clipping)
- Killing of animals as part of the experiment (including giving live animals as food)
- Surplus animals raised/acquired for the experiment

- Inappropriate social conditions, e.g. protracted isolation of gregarious or social sentient animals, unduly early weaning, or group-housing of normally solitary animals
- Prolonged restraint
- Trapping
- Collecting biological samples directly from the animal, such as tissue, blood, urine, faeces, semen, and saliva
- Induced infection, disease or parasitism
- Inappropriate release of wild-caught animals
- Adverse implications for conservation or the ecosystem

Reviewers are requested to recommend:

- 1) whether the abstract should be accepted, rejected or whether further information is required (e.g. from the author or the Ethics Committee) before a decision can be made. If the decision is made to reject the abstract, reasons should be given.
- 2) the form of presentation most suited for the abstract (e.g. plenary paper, short oral or poster presentation).

To facilitate the review process, the checklist above should be presented for authors at abstract submission. Further, the following text, including options to provide additional information, should be provided:

If your study involved any of the procedures mentioned above, please provide an ethical justification for this study. In particular, please consider:

- 1) The justification for studying this topic/subject area
- 2) The choice of research protocol

Also, if not already stated in the abstract, please give details of the research protocol, e.g.:

- 3) The frequency and duration of potentially harmful procedures
- 4) The intensity and duration of any adverse effects experienced by the animals
- 5) The monitoring and procedures in place for alleviation of any suffering.