Abstract Assessment Rubric - Faculty of Health HDR Conference 2018

	Structure and content	
Criterion	**The abstract includes…**	**Quality score range**
1. Background	…an introductory statement describing the issue or existing gap.	0-4
2. Aim/objective	…a statement clearly addressing the aims or objectives hypothesis to be tested.	0-4
3. Methods	*[original research]* …? Is the description of the study design/protocol, measures, procedures and analyses (to be) used adequately described? Is the overall study design adequately described? Is the overall study design appropriate and efficient to address the study objectives? Are the epidemiological/statistical methods concisely described? Authors should avoid naming software packages instead of epidemiologic or statistical procedures. Is the population involved stated or apparent? Is the data source (questionnaire, etc, RCTs) stated? *[literature review]* …a description of the type of literature review has been undertaken (e.g. systematic review) and the review methods used (i.e., preferred reporting checklist used, the databases searched, inclusion/exclusion criteria).	0-16 (max 4 point per sub-item)
4. Results	…a summary of the main results, with relevant statistics. Do the study results logically follow the described methods? Are study results summarized using appropriate quantitative/qualitative measures (e.g., number of individuals in study, major time, person, and place findings)? Are numerical comparisons correct and appropriate (e.g. rates for explicit or implied comparisons)? Are sufficient and adequate data presented to allow the reader to reach a conclusion?	0-4
5. Conclusions	…a brief summary of the overall findings in relation to the purpose of the study. Are the conclusion and interpretation based on the data presented? Does the conclusion/interpretation address the problem and objectives? Does the study appear sufficiently valid and reliable to serve as a basis for the conclusions (i.e. are the results unlikely to be attributable to chance, confounders, or other potential biases)? Does the author synthesize results into a conclusion (Conclusions should not simply repeat data from the results or restate them with adjectives replacing numbers)?	0-4
6. Implications (what's next)	…a statement showing how the application of innovative approaches and new learning coming from the presented work can be used in future research and practice. Do the data solve an immediate problem or build on existing knowledge (and not simply repeat what is already done with little or no effective modification)?	0-4
7. Keywords	…a set of relevant keywords (up to 5 keywords).	0-1

Abstract Assessment Rubric - Faculty of Health HDR Conference 2018

	Other criteria	
Criterion	**The work…**	**Quality score range**
8. Scientific merit	…makes good application of scientific methods and scientific rigour.	0-4
9. Health impact	…represents a significant contribution to the development of the evidence base for health care and could lead to major health benefits to individuals and/or changes in public health or clinical practice.	0-4
10. Writing	…is well presented and makes the reader want to learn more about the topic. An abstract should be a 'reader-friendly' picture of the various aspects of the presented work. A good abstract should not focus merely on one aspects of the above criteria and include quotations, abbreviations, symbols or acronyms. Is there a logical sequence and cohesiveness among and within abstract sections? Is content of each section correctly placed (i.e. results in the results section only)? Are appropriate terms/concepts consistently used throughout avoiding vague, ambiguous terms or jargon? Are instructions on word limit, abstract structure, and style adhered to?	0-5
Total score range		**0-50**

General descriptor

Within the possible range, a score should be applied to each criterion considering the presence/absence of the described item, and the related quality. For example, within the criterion "Methods", original research not reporting the adopted study design, using poor measures, describing ambiguous procedures, but clearly reporting on the analyses could be scored as follows:

Study design (0) + measures (1) + procedures (1) + analyses (4) = 6/16