

Scoring Guide for Assessing Abstracts

Audit Abstracts

The following is a guide to scoring the audit abstracts. Score 0-5 for each of novelty/originality, clarity, significance/impact/relevance to clinical practice, and quality of the methodology.

Please use the full range of scores available in order to spread the scores i.e. 0,1,2,3,4 and 5.

The total should be out of **20**.

Novelty/originality (0-5)	
Score	
0	Not original. "Nothing new"
1	Very little originality. Of local interest only
3	Some originality.
5	Highly unique.
Clarity (0-5)	
0	Completely disorganised. Jumbled. Difficult to comprehend
1	Messy. Ambiguous. Disjointed. Tables/figures poorly explained. Incomplete information
3	Adequate presentation. Fairly clear. Some incomplete information.
5	Excellent presentation. Clear. Ordered. Concise. No ambiguities
Significance/ Impact/ relevance to clinical practice (0-5)	
0	No significance whatsoever. Highly irrelevant to clinical practice.
1	Very poor significance and relevance to clinical practice.
3	Quite significant results. Of some importance to clinical practice.
5	Highly significant results. Very important and relevant to clinical practice.
Methodology (audit) (0-5)	
0	Not audit. No purpose. No clear attempt to improve or assure practice
1	Not clearly audit. Survey with only local relevance. No clear standards or evidence of plan to change practice and re audit.
3	True audit with comparison against recognised standard. Evidence of plan to change practice and re audit. Mainly of local relevance
5	Clear objective with appropriate standards, reviewed practice against standards and re audit after an intervention. Applicable to other than local practice.

Case Report / Case Series Abstracts

The following is a guide to scoring the case report / case series abstracts. Score 0-5 for each of novelty/originality, clarity, significance/impact/relevance to clinical practice, and the importance of the message for case reports.

Please use the full range of scores available in order to spread the scores i.e. 0,1,2,3,4 and 5.

The total should be out of **20**.

Novelty/originality (0-5)	
Score	
0	Well reported case report. "Nothing new"
1	Commonly reported event. Of local interest only
3	Some originality. Been reported before but has some unique features
5	Highly unique case. Never previously reported
Clarity (0-5)	
0	Completely disorganised. Jumbled. Difficult to comprehend
1	Messy. Ambiguous. Disjointed. Tables/figures poorly explained. Incomplete information
3	Adequate presentation. Fairly clear. Some incomplete information.
5	Excellent presentation. Clear. Ordered. Concise. No ambiguities. Includes all important information.
Significance/ Impact/ relevance to clinical practice (0-5)	
0	No significance whatsoever. Highly irrelevant to clinical practice.
1	Very poor significance and relevance to clinical practice.
3	Quite significant. Of some importance to clinical practice.
5	Highly significant. Very important and relevant to clinical practice.
Importance of Message of Case Report (0-5)	
0	No message. Of no importance whatsoever
1	Minimal message and importance. Minor interest only
3	Some tangible benefit to clinical practice.
5	Very important lesson for clinical practice. Shapes clinical practice.

Original Research Abstracts

The following is a guide to scoring the original research abstracts. Score 0-5 for each of novelty/originality, clarity, significance/impact/relevance to clinical practice and quality of the methodology.

Please use the full range of scores available in order to spread the scores i.e. 0,1,2,3,4 and 5.

The total should be out of **20**.

Novelty/originality (0-5)	
Score	
0	Not original. "Nothing new"
1	Very little originality.
3	Some originality.
5	Highly unique. Never previously reported
Clarity (0-5)	
0	Completely disorganised. Jumbled. Difficult to comprehend
1	Messy. Ambiguous. Disjointed. Tables/figures poorly explained. Incomplete information
3	Adequate presentation. Fairly clear. Some incomplete information.
5	Excellent presentation. Clear. Ordered. Concise. No ambiguities
Significance/ Impact/ relevance to clinical practice (0-5)	
0	No significance whatsoever. Highly irrelevant to clinical practice.
1	Very poor significance and relevance to clinical practice.
3	Quite significant results. Of some importance to clinical practice.
5	Highly significant results. Very important and relevant to clinical practice.
Methodology (0-5)	
0	No hypothesis. Methodology sloppy or ill-conceived or poorly executed
1	Hypothesis unclear. Methodology doesn't really test hypothesis or poorly conducted. Major design weaknesses. No mention of REC approval/randomisation/blinding/statistical methodology
3	Clear hypothesis. Methodology relevant with only minor weaknesses in design. Some mention of REC approval/randomisation/blinding/statistical methodology, but not all.
5	Clear relevant hypothesis which methodology accurately tests. Methodology well executed. Includes Info on REC approval/randomisation/blinding/statistical methodology

Survey Abstracts

The following is a guide to scoring the survey abstracts. Score 0-5 for each of novelty/originality, clarity, significance/impact/relevance to clinical practice, and quality of the methodology.

Please use the full range of scores available in order to spread the scores i.e. 0,1,2,3,4 and 5.

The total should be out of **20**.

Novelty/originality (0-5)	
Score	
0	Not original. "Nothing new"
1	Very little originality. Of local interest only
3	Some originality.
5	Highly unique.
Clarity (0-5)	
0	Completely disorganised. Jumbled. Difficult to comprehend
1	Messy. Ambiguous. Disjointed. Tables/figures poorly explained. Incomplete information
3	Adequate presentation. Fairly clear. Some incomplete information.
5	Excellent presentation. Clear. Ordered. Concise. No ambiguities
Significance/ Impact/ relevance to clinical practice (0-5)	
0	No significance whatsoever. Highly irrelevant to clinical practice.
1	Very poor significance and relevance to clinical practice.
3	Quite significant results. Of some importance to clinical practice.
5	Highly significant results. Very important and relevant to clinical practice.
Methodology (survey) (0-5)	
0	Very weak, unrepresentative survey. Very poor response rate (<50%). Ambiguous or irrelevant questions.
1	Survey with barely adequate response rate (50-60%). Local relevance only. Some ambiguity.
3	Reasonable survey with good representation and response rate (>70%) with some wider relevance to national practice. Clear unambiguous questions.
5	National survey with good representation, response rate (>80%). Unambiguous.