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**Introduction:** Please note that the abstract has a new format that debuted for the 2023 meeting, it is one page and a single column. The contents of the abstract should emphasize the results, their context, and their meaningfulness. This structure is loosely based on the “summary paragraph” required for *Nature* publications; see this link for an example: <https://www.nature.com/documents/nature-summary-paragraph.pdf>. Abstracts are due by 11:59 pm EDT on February 25, 2025. **Please be aware there will be no abstract deadline extension this year and all abstracts must be submitted by February 25 to be considered for presentation at the meeting.**

The “Introduction” section should provide basic information about the area of study, additional background details motivating the specific study, the research question, and any hypotheses. The general problem being addressed should be clearly stated. For hypothesis-driven research, all hypotheses should be clearly and fully stated. A full scientific hypothesis has two parts: an expected result and an explanation for that expectation, e.g., “Due to [reason], we expected [result].” The formatting requirements of the abstract are as follows:

* A 10-point Times New Roman font must be used for the main text. Other fonts are acceptable for text within figures and tables, but their size must be at least 9-point.
* The main text of the abstract should be divided into sections with headings of “Introduction,” “Methods,” “Results & Discussion,” “Significance,” and “References.”
* Acknowledgements, as needed, should be positioned between the Significance and References section.
* The first line of each section should start on the same line as the section header, with no indentation and a colon separating the heading from the text (see above for example). Each additional paragraph within the section should be indented by 0.2 inches.
* Sections should be separated by a blank line of 10-point Times New Roman.
* Margins should be 0.5 inches on all sides.
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**Figure 1:** Figures must include a caption of at least 9-point font. Figures may be any reasonable size and must be referenced in the text (“Fig. 1”) and be positioned on the far-left or far-right of the page with the abstract text wrapped square around the figure and caption. Tables may also be included.

Abstracts should include references numbered in their order of appearance, using [1] to cite the first reference in-text, [2] for the second reference, etc. Abstracts are limited to ***one page only***. Longer submissions will be rejected.

**Methods:** Briefly explain the methods used. It is not necessary to exhaustively explain standard methods. Provide enough detail for a reviewer in your general field to assess the validity of the methods and understand the main approach taken.

The methods section will typically only be about one-third of the total text. However, if your abstract describes a methods-focused study, e.g., the development and validation of a new approach or tool, or if your methods are extremely novel/new, then this section could be longer.

**Results & Discussion:** The main results and their context, interpretation, and meaningfulness should be the focal point of the abstract. Results and discussion can be one combined section, e.g., noting a finding and its implications, then the next finding and its implications, etc., or there can be separate “Results” and “Discussion” sections like most journal articles. In either case, the abstract should clearly indicate the main finding and how it builds on previous knowledge or compares to what was previously understood about the question asked. If hypotheses were posed, explain if the results are consistent or inconsistent with the hypotheses.

Keep in mind the distinction between *data* and *results*. Data are the information gathered. It is generally effective to present data in figures and/or tables. All figures and tables should be referenced in the main text, e.g., “Cylinder-carriage had roughly equal moment arms to the hip and knee, while sphere carriage had a relatively long hip moment arm and short knee moment arm (Fig. 1).” Results are the interpretation of the data, i.e., what these data mean, and can be written out, e.g., “Carrying a cylinder distributes extensor muscle forces more evenly between the hip and knee vs. carrying a sphere of equal mass.”

**Significance:** Explain the significance of the study. Some questions to think about when writing an effective “Significance” section are: How are your results relevant to your field? How are they potentially impactful outside of your field? What is possible now that was not possible before the study was completed? Will the results impact clinical care? Will the results change how people think about a particular problem? Be sure to consider and discuss the broader implications of your work.

**Acknowledgments:** Any sources of support or other important contributions or contributors to the work should be noted here.

**References:** The format of the reference list can be brief and does not have strict requirements but must include the minimum information needed for readers to unambiguously determine the reference. For example: [1] Reinbolt et al. (2005), *J Biomech* 38(3); [2] Finley et al. (2013), *J Physiol* 591(4).