Free Paper/Poster Abstract Scoring Rubric

METHOD: *Identify the study design*

LEVEL OF EVIDENCE	QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH (OR)					
	INTERVENTION	***PROGNOSIS***	***DIAGNOSIS***	***PREVALENCE***	***ECONOMIC***	***HEALTH SERVICES/IMPLEMENTATION RESEARCH***
Excellent	SR of RCTs *OR*	SR of cohorts *OR*	SR of Level 1 diagnostic studies *OR*	SR of prospective cohorts *OR*	SR of Level 1 economic studies *OR*	theoretically informed, powered for process/implementation and economic outcomes
	RCT (Narrow CI's)	Cohort >80% follow up *OR*	Validating cohort study with good reference measures	Prospective cohort with good follow-up *OR*	Analysis based on clinically sensible costs + sensitivity analyses *OR*	
		All or none case series		All or none case series	Absolute better-value or worse-value analyses	
Very Good	SR of cohort studies *OR*	SR of retrospective cohorts *OR*	SR of Level >2 diagnostic studies *OR*	SR of Level 2+ studies *OR*	SR of Level 2+ studies *OR*	theoretically informed, powered for process/implementation outcomes
	Individual cohort study (inc low quality RCT) *OR*	Retrospective cohort *OR*	Exploratory cohort with good reference standards	Retrospective cohort study *OR*	Audit of outcomes research	
	Instrument validation "very good" according to COSMIN					
	Outcomes Research	Outcomes Research		Ecological studies		
Good	SR of case-control studies *OR*		Non-consecutive study; or without consistently applied reference standards	Non-consecutive cohort study, or very limited population	Analysis based on limited alternatives or costs, poor quality estimates of data, but incl sensitivity analyses	small scale, process/implementation outcomes
	Individual Case-Control Study *OR*					
	Instrument validation / reliability (complex / original / multiple items)					
Reasonable	Case-series (and poor quality cohort and case-control studies)	Case-series (and poor quality prognostic cohort studies	Case-control study, poor or non-independent reference standard	Case-series or superseded reference standards	Analysis with no sensitivity analysis	
	Instrument validation / reliability (repeat popn / single item)					

LEVEL OF EVIDENCE	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH		
		FEATURES	***PRACTICE IMP***
Excellent	**Generalisable studies**	Sampling focused by theory and literature, extended as a result of analysis to capture diversity of experience. Analytic procedures comprehensive and clear.	Clear indications for practice or policy may offer support for current practice, or critique with indicated directions for change.
Very Good	**Conceptual studies**	Theoretical concepts guide sample selection, based on analysis of literature. May be limited to one group about which little is known or a number of important subgroups. Conceptual analysis recognizes diversity in participants' views.	Weaker designs identify the need for further research on other groups, or urge caution in practice. Well-developed studies can provide good evidence if residual uncertainties are clearly identified.
Good	**Descriptive studies**	Sample illustrates practical rather than theoretical issues. Record a range of illustrative quotes inc themes from ''many,'' ''most,'' or ''some'' participants.	Demonstrate that a phenomenon exists in a defined group. Identify practice issues for further consideration.
Reasonable	**Single case study**	Provides rich data on the views or experiences of one person. Can provide insights in unexplored contexts	Alerts practitioners to the existence of an unusual phenomenon.

Unacceptable	Expert opinion without explicit critical appraisal		**Unacceptable**	Expert opinion without explicit critical appraisal

METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY: *Identify the study quality and limitations*		**SCORE**
EXCEPTIONAL:	Method very well described, appropriate to the question and innovative AND 'excellent' or 'very good' level of evidence OR highest level of evidence appropriate for research question	**5**
EXCELLENT:	Method very well described, appropriate to the question and innovative AND 'good' or 'reasonable' level of evidence (quant or qual)	**4**
VERY GOOD:	Method fully described, appropriate and adapted to answer the specific research question AND 'excellent' or 'very good' level of evidence OR highest level of evidence appropriate for research ques	**3**
GOOD:	Method fully described, appropriate and adapted to answer the specific research question AND 'excellent' or 'very good' level of evidence (quant or qual)	**2**
REASONABLE:	Method reasonably described, alternative methods may have been more appropriate	**1**
UNACCEPTABLE:	Method fundamentally flawed, poorly described, no data presented in abstract ***OR*** previously presented at AusACPDM	**0**

IMPACT ON THE FIELD: *Identify likely impact and interest to AusACPDM/IAACD audience*		**SCORE**
SIGNIFICANT:	Important outcome, change to practice implemented/planned for/built into study design, high interest	**4**
VERY HIGH:	Important outcome, potential to change practice, high interest	**3**
HIGH:	Novel and adds new and important information to evidence base	**2**
LOWER:	Repetition with no new features, low impact	**1**
NEGLIGIBLE:	Unlikely to impact practice	**0**

ORIGINALITY: *Does this piece of work investigate something new, or utilise a new approach to analysis etc*		**SCORE**
EXCELLENT:	Innovative, imaginative, cutting edge, novel approach and research creating new knowledge	**3**
GOOD:	Original research question; unique slant on common problem, may create new knowledge	**2**
REASONABLE:	Replication and extension of previous work, may help clarify ambiguous results	**1**
POOR:	Repetition of previous work, answer to research question already widely accepted	**0**

ABSTRACT PRESENTATION		**SCORE**
EXCELLENT:	Outstanding abstract, well formatted, succinct and fluent with clearly presented conclusion	**3**
GOOD:	Well written abstract, correctly formatted	**2**
REASONABLE:	Abstract presentation average, limited by poor format or poor conclusion to question	**1**
POOR:	General sense of abstract difficult to understand, poorly written and formatted	**0**

	Total	**/ 15**