

## **RPS Annual Science and Research Summit 2020**

### **Abstract Judging Criteria**

#### **The judging grid**

The judging grid is used in the assessment of all abstracts submitted to the RPS Science and Research Summit 2020, including clinical research, health services research (inclusive of pharmacy practice and education), systematic reviews and other research projects. It is important to consider whether your abstract meets these criteria before you submit.

#### **Additional information and rationale**

The judging criteria are adapted from a number of internationally recognised sources and based on best practice experience. International guidelines for the reporting of research via abstracts include [CONSORT](#) for the reporting of randomised-controlled trials, [STROBE](#) for the reporting of observational studies and [PRISMA](#) for the reporting of systematic reviews. If your study falls within one of these categories, please refer to the relevant abstract checklist for details on the key judging areas.

Where appropriate, the review committee will use CONSORT/STROBE/PRISMA checklist details to assess your abstract. For example:

- A **randomised controlled trial** in terms of method should report: “*Eligibility criteria for participants and the settings where the data were collected, interventions intended for each group, specific objective or hypothesis, clearly defined primary outcome for this report, how participants were allocated to interventions and whether participants, care givers, and those assessing the outcomes were blinded to group assignment*” – CONSORT
- A **systematic review** in terms of limitations should include: “*limitations at study and outcome level (e.g. risk of bias) and at review-level (e.g. incomplete retrieval of identified research reporting bias)*” – PRISMA.

For further information about best practice in reporting, please refer to guidance available via the [EQUATOR](#) network.

For more detailed abstract writing guidance and to access the submission form, please visit our Summit webpages at [www.rpharms.com](http://www.rpharms.com).

The deadline for abstract submissions is **5pm GMT on Friday 14<sup>th</sup> February**

## The judging grid

Criteria	0	1	2
<b>Relevance and novelty</b>			
Is the work relevant to pharmacy?	The work is not relevant	The work is partly relevant	The work is fully or largely relevant
Is the work novel?	Similar work has been conducted previously	Similar work has been conducted previously but the setting, population and/or methods used are different.	The work appears novel and original
<b>Title</b>			
Does the title accurately reflect the study reported?	The title does not reflect the focus or design of the study	The title somewhat reflects the focus and design of the study	The title clearly reflects the focus and design of the study
<b>Introduction</b>			
Does the introduction clearly explain the rationale and significance of the study?	The rationale and significance of the study are not explained	The rationale and significance of the study are only partly explained and/or lack clarity	The rationale and significance of the study are clearly explained
Is the research aim clearly stated?	The research aim is not stated	The research aim is stated but lacks clarity	The research aim is clearly stated
<b>Design and methods</b>			
Is the design appropriate?	The design is not appropriate to the research aim	The design appears appropriate to the research aim, though other methods may have been more suitable.	The design is entirely appropriate to the research aim
Is the method clearly described?	The method is not clearly described	The method is described but lacks clarity	The method is clearly described
<b>Results</b>			
Does the work include data or findings which address the aims of the study?	The data or findings do not address the aims of the study	The data or findings partly address the aims of the study	The data or findings fully or largely address the aims of the study
Are the results fully and clearly presented?	There are major omissions and a lack of clarity in the results	There are some omissions or lack of clarity in the results	The results are fully and clearly presented
<b>Discussion/conclusions</b>			
Does the discussion reflect the findings and limitations?	The discussion does not reflect the findings or limitations	The discussion partly reflects the findings and limitations	The discussion fully or largely reflects the findings and limitations
Are the importance of the findings and their implications clearly stated?	The importance of the findings and their implications are not discussed	The findings are alluded to but their importance and implications are not discussed within a wider perspective	The importance of the findings and their implications are discussed and clearly outlined