

Abstract review criteria

PRIME Centre Wales Annual Meeting 2022, 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 PRIME annual meeting remit of Inclusion in Primary, Emergency and Unscheduled Care Research.

The following areas will be considered by reviewers when scoring presentation abstracts submissions:

1) Importance of the problem or topic

- Is the problem (or topic area) original/important/relevant to Inclusion in Primary/Emergency/Unscheduled-Care Research?
- Are the aims of the study 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? (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

- Was this a well written abstract?
- Was it well presented?
- Will it promote discussion/debate?
- 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, well designed and well conducted work at all stages of development / delivery and ask reviewers 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 and importance. Reviewers are asked to mark abstracts using the full range of scores (1-5) stated for each of the criteria.

A high scoring abstract will:

- identify an important problem (one which responds to a clear gap in the literature; a practice or policy priority; a topic which is fundamental to Inclusion in Primary/Emergency/Unscheduled-Care Research)
- describe a clear research question and aim
- set out an appropriate study design which is capable of meeting the stated aims
- offer a clear description of methods and methodological approach

- include findings which are trustworthy, or - for work in progress - a compelling conclusion and/or discussion which justifies the approach being taken in the ongoing research

A lower scoring abstract is likely to include poorly focused research that is not highly relevant to Inclusion Primary/Emergency/Unscheduled Care Research or which is poorly designed or executed.