

## Abstract review criteria

*PRIME Centre Wales Annual Meeting, Wrexham, 1<sup>st</sup> November 2023*

### *Call for abstracts*

Abstract peer reviewers will be asked to assess the soundness of the scholarship and the extent to which your abstract aligns with the work of PRIME.

The following areas will be considered by reviewers when scoring presentation abstracts submissions (**300 words total**):

#### 1) Importance of the problem or topic

- Is the problem (or topic area) original/important/relevant to the work of PRIME?
- Is it relevant to problems in Wales policy and practice in Wales?
- Are the aims of the study (or topic) clearly described?

#### 2) The approach (design/methods)

- Is the study design appropriate for the stated research question(s) and aims?
- Are the methods/methodological approach clearly described?
- What is the overall quality of the study methods employed (or proposed)?

#### 3) Findings

- Are the key findings clearly described?
- How confident is the reviewer in the strength/trustworthiness of the findings and/or conclusions/discussion presented? (For work in progress reviewers will be asked to assess the quality of the conclusion and/or discussion, taking into account interim findings/conclusions and how well the author describes plans for progressing the research)

#### 4) Consequences (significance) / implications

- How important are these research findings?
- How and to what extent are the findings likely to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy in Wales? (For work in progress reviewers will be asked to consider the potential of the project to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy)

## 5) Overall impression

- Quality – is the research / topic presented in the abstract of high quality?
- Relevance - to the work of PRIME and to clinical or research practice, education or policy in Wales
- Interest - is the research / topic presented in the abstract likely to promote discussion/debate, stimulate interest, or lead to future work or collaborations?
- Importance - will this study/idea change anything?

## Peer review process

All submitted abstracts will be reviewed independently by at least two peer reviewers, including one lay member. The aim of this process is to ensure a high-quality programme of presentations.

We welcome interesting, relevant, well designed and well conducted work at all stages of development / delivery. Reviewers will be asked to give equivalent weight to abstracts relating to work-in-progress, completed work and works highlighting best practice patient and public involvement.

The main focus of our peer review process is the extent to which submissions meet the criteria for quality, relevance, interest and importance. Reviewers are asked to mark abstracts using the full range of scores (1-5) stated for each of the criteria.