2026 Master Brewers Conference - Abstract Submission Guide

Abstract Requirements

All abstracts should adhere to the following guidelines:

Length - 300 words

Structure - Authors are encouraged to structure abstracts using the following components:

1. **Title** – Clear, concise, and reflective of the content

2. **Background / Purpose** (Why) – Why the work matters. Briefly explain the context and purpose of the work.

3. **Methods / Evidence Review** (How) – How the work/evidence was conducted or reviewed. Describe the methods, approach, or guidelines used.

4. **Key Findings / Lessons** (So What?)– Summarize the primary results, insights, or lessons learned.

5. **Implications / Conclusion** (Now What?) – Why this work is important and what others can take away.

Formatting

- Written in **plain language** where possible

- No charts, tables, or images

- Limit jargon and spell out acronyms on first use

Submission Requirements

- **Submitter's name, email, and role** (Presenting Author, Organizer, Co-Author, Proposed Speaker)

- **Author organizations, job title, and credentials**

- **Additional authors (name, job title, email, role, organization, and credentials)**

- **Submission Category**

    o Focus Session (30-45 minutes)

    o Brewtech Session (10-minute paid technology demonstration)

    o Post-Meeting Workshop / Field Trip

    o Abstract (20-min Oral presentation abstract, Poster session abstract, or Either)

- **3-5 Topic Keywords** (examples include sanitation, yeast management, brewing fundamentals, etc)

- **Was this abstract submitted on behalf of an MBAA District or Committee?**

- **Was this abstract previously published or presented? If yes, where?**

Eligibility

- Work may be in progress, but must have **clear preliminary insights**
- Submissions must be the author's **original work**

Abstract Scoring Rubric

Each abstract is scored on a **1–5 scale** in each category (1 = weak, 5 = exceptional).
Total possible score: **25 points**.

Category	What Reviewers Look For	Points
1. Relevance to MBAA Theme & Audience	Alignment with conference goals; submission category fit; potential to contribute meaningfully to the audience	1–5
2. Clarity & Organization	Clear writing, logical flow, well-structured abstract-structured abstract	1–5
3. Practical Implementation / Innovation	Practical implications meaningful to audience; unique perspectives, creative approaches, or new findings	1–5
4. Quality of Approach & Findings	Strength of methods, depth of analysis, credibility of findings, insights, or lessons learned	1–5
5. Significance / Potential Impact	Importance of the work, implications for practical application or research, usefulness to attendees	1–5
Reviewer Comments:	Overall thoughts and recommendations.	N/A

Reviewer Rating Guide (1–5 scale)

5 – Exceptional: Clear, compelling, highly aligned; innovative; strong methodology or powerful insights; very high relevance.

4 – Strong: Well-written, meaningful contribution with solid approach; minor areas for improvement.

3 – Adequate: Meets baseline quality; relevance is present but not strong; approach or clarity could be improved.

2 – Weak: Unclear focus, insufficient detail, questionable relevance.

1 – Poor: Does not meet minimum requirements; not aligned with themes; unclear or incomplete.