

Abstract Scoring Rubric ANZCA ASM 2022

Attribute	Very poor = 1	Poor = 2	Fair = 3	Good = 4	Excellent = 5	Score
General: The study needs to be ethical and legal. The abstract should be structured (introduction, methods, results, conclusion), comply with reporting guidelines, and comply with ANZCA ASM specifications.						
Language and scientific terminology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many spelling/grammar mistakes Poor scientific writing Poor readability; incorrect use of scientific terms Acronyms not defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some spelling/grammar mistakes Some incorrect use of scientific terms Poor readability Acronyms not defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct spelling Grammatical errors present Excessive use of jargon Acronyms not defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct grammar/spelling Adequate readability Some acronyms inconsistent or not defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct grammar/spelling High readability Jargon is minimized Acronyms are defined 	
Introduction and aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction/background unrelated to the study Study hypothesis is not provided or unable to be understood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction is vaguely related to the study Aim/hypothesis are unrelated to the background 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction only partly justifies the study. Aim/hypothesis is unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate background information Hypothesis and aim(s) are related and testable, but lack some clarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction clearly justifies the study Hypothesis and aim are clear and testable Variables clearly specified 	
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods are poorly described and lack detail Methodology does not relate to the aims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods are inadequately described Errors or omissions in how methods will address the aims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods appear appropriate but lack significant detail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods are clear and specific enough to allow replication, but minor improvements are possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods are clear and sufficiently detailed Methods are able to address the hypothesis No improvement possible 	
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critically important data are missing. Data are poorly presented and/or do not address the stated outcome(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data provided are incomplete or do not address the primary outcome(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data are recorded, but disorganised and difficult to follow Statistical detail is absent or inadequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key findings are reported but lack some clarity Some statistical detail may be missing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All data and keys findings are reported; essential statistical detail provided Results presented in an unbiased manner 	
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions are not stated, are unclear, and/or are unrelated to the aims of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions are not supported by results. Conclusions are only loosely related to study aims. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implications of the results are not clear Conclusions are not clearly supported by results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions are supported by results, but do not describe significance of results or adequately link their use for future application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions are supported by and effectively synthesise the results Results are utilised to denote their significance and/or suggest future direction. 	
Study design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a scientific study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit without reaudit Case report Survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit with reaudit Quality improvement project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All other study types (including systematic review) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single centred RCT Multi-centred study even if it was not an RCT 	
Scientific value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a scientific study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A scientific study but not useful to anaesthesia body outside of the index institution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds some information to a large existing body of evidence Useful to anaesthesia body outside of the index institution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds significant information to current evidence Useful to anaesthesia body outside of the index institution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Novel, adds significant new scientific information to current evidence Useful to anaesthesia body outside of the index institution 	