

Marking sheet for UKCPA awards and conference abstracts (research and audit)

Notes

Scoring

Please score each section of the paper using the scales given to indicate the strength of each section (where the lowest score signifies a very weak section and the highest score signifies a very strong section). Then compile an overall score for each abstract (a sum of all scores). As the overall score is based on the strength of each section, this makes it objectively easier to order the papers at the end.

Award submissions

To streamline abstract submission processes and encourage award submissions, authors are asked to indicate within their submission whether they would also like their abstract to be considered for an appropriate award. Abstract adjudicators do not need to mark these award submissions differently to those submitted for conferences, but the Chair of Adjudicators will identify the award winner from the highest mark given.

Minimum scores for acceptance

For ABSTRACT SUBMISSIONS for CONFERENCES, a minimum score of 21 (out of 35) is required for acceptance.

FOR AWARD SUBMISSIONS, a minimum score of 23 (out of 35) is required in order for a submission to be considered for the award.

Abstract title	Background	Objectives	Methods	Results	Conclusions	Contribution to field	Writing style & adherence to guidelines	Recommend for oral presentation? (If applicable)	Total score
	Has the author given sufficient and robust background information to justify the conduct of the study?	Are they clear, achievable, and realistic?	Are they appropriate, valid, and well thought through to meet the stated objectives? Are audit standards clear and applicable? Does the author state the date the study was undertaken? Does the author state if ethics approval was required, and if so whether it was approved?	Are they clearly presented, and address the objectives?	Are the limitations & validity of the study considered? Are the implications of results for practice made clear? Is the work reproducible? Is there consideration of the sustainability & generalisability of the results? Are the conclusions justifiable, and do they fit with the original objectives?	Does the work strengthen the existing evidence base or bring new evidence to the topic? Does the work have an impact on patient safety, care and efficiencies?	Is the language and grammar of an appropriate standard? Is the abstract clear and coherent? Does it conform to the abstract requirements, including anonymity?		
Scoring range ↻		(0-5)	(0-5)	(0-5)	(0-5)	(0-5)	(0-5)	Yes/No	(0-35)

Please provide constructive comments to authors for each abstract. If an abstract is borderline for acceptance, please comment on how you think it may be improved for resubmission.

Abstract number	Abstract title	Comments