



## RPS Winter Summit Abstract Judging Criteria

### Section I: The judging grid

The judging criteria for the RPS Winter summit is used in the assessment of all submissions, including scientific research, clinical research, health services research (including pharmacy practice and education) and systematic reviews.

It is important to consider whether your abstract meets all of the criteria set out below:

Criteria	0	1	2
<b>Relevance and novelty</b>			
Is the work relevant to pharmacy or pharmaceutical science?	The work is not relevant to a significant degree	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 were different.	The work appears novel and original
<b>Title</b>			
Does the title accurately reflect the study reported?	The title does not link to the study focus or design	The link between the title and the study focus and design could have been be more clearly expressed	The title links clearly to both focus and design
<b>Aim</b>			
Are the research question/aim and objectives clearly stated?	The research question/aim and objectives are not stated	The research question/aim and objectives are stated but lack clarity	The research question/aim and objectives are clearly stated
<b>Design and methodology</b> [ as per applicable guidelines described in Section II ]			
Is the design appropriate?	The design is not appropriate	The design seems appropriate, though other methods could have been more applicable.	The design is entirely appropriate to the research question
Is the method clearly described?	The method is not clearly described	The method is partly described but lacks clarity	The method is clearly and unequivocally 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 to a significant degree	The data or findings partially address the aims of the study	The data or findings fully or largely address the aims of the study
Are the results fully and	There are major	There are some	The results are fully and

clearly presented?	omissions and a lack of clarity in the results	omissions or lack of clarity in the results	clearly presented
<b>Discussion / conclusions</b>			
Does the discussion reflect the findings and limitations?	The discussion does not reflect the findings or limitations to a significant degree	The discussion partly reflects the findings and limitations	The discussion fully or largely reflects the findings and limitations
Are the important implications clearly stated?	The importance and findings of the study are not discussed to a significant degree	The findings are alluded to but importance not discussed within a wider perspective	Important findings are discussed and their implications clearly outlined

## **Section II: Further judging 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, abstract judges will use PRISMA/CONSORT/ STROBE 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, see the guidance available via the **EQUATOR** network.

The RPS Winter Summit 2017 will be running a single stage submission and authors will not have the opportunity to address substantive issues or to resubmit. The decision of the abstract review committee is final.

## **Common mistakes**

The following are some of the most common issues reported by the abstract reviewer committee:

- the aims of the study are unclear
- methods and results do not fully address the aim
- the sampling approach and method are unclear
- the results reported do not align with the methods used
- the results are poorly articulated

- study limitations are not identified
- the discussion does not link to the actual results reported

See the RPS Winter Summit [Instructions for authors](#) for further guidance on the content and layout of your abstract.