

Competition Guidelines

Foundation for Osteopathic Emergency Medicine

142 E. Ontario Street, Suite 1500

Chicago, Illinois 60611

www.FOEM.org

Table of Contents

General Rules and Requirements for participation	3
Competition Descriptions and Specific Guidelines	5
Case Study Poster Competition	6
Clinical Pathological Case Competition (CPC)	11
Oral Abstract Competition	17
Resident Research Paper Competition.....	21
Resident Research Poster Competition.....	26
Application	31

General Rules and Requirements for Participation

1. Entrants must be members of the American College of Osteopathic Emergency Physicians (ACOEP) at either the Student, Resident, Associate, or Active levels.
2. Residents entering competitions must be an active member of the ACOEP. The residency program must be a member of the FOEM Research Network (FRN). Residents or Fellows completing their training in the calendar year in which they present may present either as a Resident for the research competitions or a faculty member for the case presentation competition.
3. All electronic submissions must be submitted directly through www.foem.org by the applicable deadline. **Late entries will not be accepted.**
4. All protected health information must be eliminated in compliance with Federal laws prior to submission. Violation of patient confidentiality by failure to de-identify the submitted information is grounds for disqualification.
5. Research submitted to FOEM competitions must be in the designated format for the specific competition. Applicants are not allowed to submit the same project for multiple competitions.
6. Files submitted to accompany applications must be in one of the following formats:
 - An unprotected Microsoft® Word® 97-2003 binary (.doc) or XML (.docx) file for all documents.
 - An unprotected Microsoft® PowerPoint® presentation binary (.ppt) or XML (.pptx) file for all presentations.
 - Graphics (x-rays, CT/ MRI/ ultrasound, photographs) are to be optimized for display at 1024 x 768 pixels in one the following formats: Joint Photographic Experts Group (.jpg or .jpeg), Portable Network Graphics (.png). Videos must be in Windows Media Video (.wmv) or MPEG-4 Part 14 (.mp4).
 - Audio files must be in Windows Media Audio (.wma) or MPEG-1/ MPEG-2 Audio Layer III (.mp3).
 - Graphics, audio files, and video files must be included as separate files even if embedded into a presentation.
7. Presentations must use Arial 26 point or larger font and contrasting text/ background colors.
8. Abstracts must be no more than 500 words.

9. References must be submitted in a separate document in format consistent with the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) in their Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication. <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/>
10. Programs disqualified from competitions for unethical behavior, including but not limited to plagiarism or academic dishonesty, may be banned from future competitions for a period of time to be determined by the officers of FOEM.

Competition Descriptions and Specific Guidelines

The Foundation for Osteopathic Emergency Medicine (FOEM) sponsors five specific competitions during the calendar year. These are the Case Poster Competition, Clinical Pathological Case Competition (CPC), Oral Abstract Competition, Resident Research Paper Competition and Resident Research Poster Competition. Each has its specific requirements for participants and presentation formats which are strictly adhered to.

Case Study Poster Competition

The Foundation's Case Study Poster Competition is scheduled annually during the Spring Seminar of the American College of Osteopathic Emergency Physicians (ACOEP). The competition is open to residents and students who have completed a case research in an emergency medicine-related area during the training year for residents or during an emergency medicine rotation for students.

Competition Format

Accepted Posters will be placed on display for a specific time prior to the beginning of the competition. During this time, conference participants will be allowed to view the poster prior to the presentation period.

Each presenter will be assigned a time to present their poster to an audience of physicians. The presenter will be given 7 minutes for the presentation of the case and up to three minutes for questions. The judges will judge the presenter on the poster content and presentation. At the end of the presentations, judges will adjourn to discuss their grading of the posters.

Photos of winning posters and presenters will be placed on the Foundation's website for a period of time and recognition will be placed on the website and noted to the winner's institution.

Competition Requirements

All entries must be submitted on the designated form, found on the Foundation's website or at the end of this document by **January 31st**. Entries received after this date will not be accepted.

All entries must include an abstract as a writeable Word[®] document (.doc) of 500 words or less.

All applicants will be notified of their acceptance or non-acceptance by the Foundation via email by **March 1** annually. Accepted applicants will be provided with the dates for display and judging.

Abstracts

The abstract will be used as the initial screening tool. It is limited to 500 words.

Case Report Abstract Format

Title – The title is a summary of the abstract itself and should convince the reader that the topic is important, relevant, and innovative.

Authors – Include name, degree and institutional affiliation. The authors included should be those who contribute significantly to the intellectual content of the case report.

Introduction - Describe the context of the case and explain its relevance and importance. Describe whether the case is unique. If not, does the case have an unusual diagnosis, prognosis, therapy or harm? Is the case an unusual presentation of a common condition? Or an unusual complication of a disease or management? Describe the instructive or teaching points that add value to this case. Does it demonstrate a cost-effective approach to management or alternative diagnostic/treatment strategy? Does it increase awareness of a rare condition?

Case description – Follow the basic rules of medical communication. Report the case in sequence. Describe the history, examination and investigations adequately. Is the cause of the patient's illness clear-cut? What are other plausible explanations? Describe the treatments adequately. Have all available therapeutic options been considered? Are outcomes related to treatments? Include the patient's progress and outcome.

Discussion – Discuss rationale for decisions that were made and the lesson from the case. Report a literature review of other similar cases. Describe how this case is different from those previously reported. Explain the rationale for reporting the case. What is unusual about the case? Does it challenge prevailing wisdom? In the future, could things be done differently in a similar case?

Poster Format

Posters must be supplied as a one-page PowerPoint presentation in widescreen (16:9) orientation. No physical posters should be printed or transported, as FOEM competitions are 100% digital.

Posters must contain an in-depth introduction and history of the case. The poster should include a discussion of the clinical emergency medicine course of the case, including the following as pertinent to the case - chief complaint; history of present illness, history (medical, surgical, family); allergies; medications; review of systems; physical examination (including vitals signs); review of system; physical examination; ED Course; test results; diagnosis and disposition. Charts, graphs, and photographs should be included as applicable. Posters must also include references.

Posters not meeting these criteria will have points deducted at the time of judging.

Case Poster Awards

The top three poster presenters will receive a written certificate, suitable for framing, from the Foundation and monetary awards of \$500, \$250, and \$125, respectively. Additionally, all three winning presenters will receive paid admission to the Foundation's Gala (held at the ACOEP Scientific Assembly) at which time they will receive an award denoting their winning status. Travel expenses will not be provided to this function.

Abstracts from the poster presentations will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, e.g., WestJEM, JAOA, or the Foundation’s annual research publication, The Research Beacon. While the Foundation cannot ensure publication, we will endeavor to have these published. If you wish to withhold your abstract from publication, you must notify FOEM in writing.

Judging Criteria

Area	Item	Options	Score
I. Relevance and History			
	A. Relevance to Emergency Medicine		
		Highly relevant to Emergency Medicine	5
			4
		Moderate relevance to Emergency Medicine	3
			2
		Did not demonstrate relevance to Emergency Medicine	1
	B. Introduction and History		
		Complete introduction and pertinent history provided	5
			4
		Partially complete introduction and history	3
			2
		Significant omissions in the history or poor introduction	1
II. Differential Diagnosis			
	A. Breadth of the differential diagnosis		
		Appropriately broad differential	5
			4
		Generally broad differential but missing key system pathology	3
			2
		Narrow differential diagnosis	1
	B. Life-threatening etiologies covered		
		All pertinent life-threatening etiologies are included in the differential	5
			4
		A few unlikely but pertinent life-threatening etiologies are not covered	3
			2
		Significant pertinent threats to life are missing from the differential diagnosis	1
	C. Obscure pathology weighted appropriately		
		Obscure etiologies covered but not to the detriment of common disease processes	3
			2
		Obscure etiologies dominate the differential	1
III. Clinical Discussion			
	A. Clinical Discussion		

		Clinical discussion is clear and concise	5
			4
		Clinical discussion is clear but not concise	3
			2
		Clinical discussion is unclear	1
	B. Integration of Presentation and Conclusions		
		Discussion clearly links and elegantly transitions between presentation and conclusions	5
			4
		Discussion is disjointed but adequately transitions between presentation and conclusions	3
			2
		Discussion is disjointed and does not transition well between presentation and conclusions	1
IV. Poster and Presentation			
	A. Poster follows appropriate format (introduction, HPI, clinical and test findings, treatment plan with justification, conclusion)		
		Complies with the standard format	5
			4
		Complies with the standard format but omission of one section	3
			2
		Uses non-standard format or multiple omissions	1
	B. Tables and figures are clear and legible		
		Appropriate text and graphic size, easy to see pertinent information	5
			4
		Text too small or large, graphics blurry but discernable, challenging to see pertinent information	3
			2
		Exceedingly crowded text, unable to discern pertinent information from graphics	1
	C. Appropriate reference list provided		
		Comprehensive list of references provided	5
			4
		Excessive or somewhat sparse list of references provided	3
			2
		Clearly inadequate list of references provided	1
	D. Spelling and grammar		
		Correct spelling, use of technical terms, and grammar	5
			4
		Rare errors in spelling, use of technical terms, or grammar	3
			2
		Frequent errors in spelling, use of technical terms, or grammar	1
V. Overall Impression			
	A. Overall impression of the poster		

		Exceptional quality	5
			4
		High quality	3
			2
		Poor quality	1
	B. Overall impression of the presentation		
		Exceptional quality	5
			4
		High quality	3
			2
		Poor quality	1

Clinical Pathological Case (CPC) Competition

The Foundation's Clinical Pathological Case (CPC) Competition is scheduled during the ACOEP's Scientific Assembly held annually during the early fall. This fun, challenging and spirited competition draws a large crowd from academia and the general population of the Assembly by pitting residents against program faculty as difficult cases presented by residents and solved by faculty discussants.

To participate, residency or fellowship programs meeting criteria described in the General Guidelines must submit one complete application which includes the names of both a resident/fellow and faculty member who will represent the program, the case and solution, and the required entrance fee of \$150, by the submission deadline of **July 31** annually. Applications received after this deadline will be returned to the institution. The application is found in the Application Section of this Handbook.

Any institution found to withhold information necessary to solve the case at the time of submission or presented by the Resident Presenter that has not been made available to the Faculty Discussant will automatically be disqualified.

Scholarly Activity will be allocated to Faculty Discussants and will be acknowledged in a formal letter from the Foundation. The roles of the Resident Presenter, who must supply the case and a Faculty Discussant, who will solve the case, are described below.

Resident Presenters' Role

1. The named Resident or Fellow Presenter must meet the criteria described in the General Requirements Section.
2. Presenters must select a case from the current or recently completed academic year of training that was challenging and of interest to other emergency physicians. Presenters should have personal knowledge of the case and should be one in which they were involved. Examples of cases are the typical presentation of an unusual disease or an atypical presentation of a common disease. Cases that are impossible to diagnose without further information or studies not usually done in the emergency department will not be accepted.
3. Presenters must submit a complete patient history that has all patient identifiers removed; failure to remove patient identifiers immediately disqualify the resident and institution. (See General Rules)

Patient related information should include all information available to the physician in the emergency department. All images and complete studies should be included if they were

performed in the ED. Failure to remove all patient identifying information is grounds for disqualification. FOEM will blind the information about the residency before it is sent to the faculty discussant.

This information must be submitted in the format described in the General Requirement section, item 6, page 4.

The best cases present a collection of historical facts, physical findings and test abnormalities which, when put together by an astute emergency physician in a logical manner, suggest a final diagnosis to the unusual case.

CPC Format

Resident Submission

Case reports must be submitted in writeable Word® documents described on page 4 and have 1.5" margins, with a header bearing the name of the institution, and Resident Presenter in the upper right hand portion of the header. Pages must also be numbered. The reports should provide the following information in this order:

Physical Findings, including complaint; history of present illness, history (medical, surgical, family); allergies; medications; review of systems; physical examination (including vital signs).

Tests Ordered, including all x-rays, EKGs, EEGs, CAT Scans, laboratory tests and other diagnostic procedures ordered. All images for each study should be included.

Test Results, please do not interpret any tests or laboratory findings

Brief Discussion of the ED course of treatment, if helpful in solving the case; however, all information available to the emergency physician must be included

The solution to the case must be submitted on a separate page titled, **Case Solution**, as part of the Case Report. This must include all references written in a standard editorial format.

The Resident Presenter **is required** to present the submitted case report and final diagnosis.

Faculty Discussant

All physicians presenting as a Faculty Discussant, must hold core faculty or faculty status in the residency or fellowship program which they are representing.

Faculty Discussants will receive a case, selected at random, to solve by **August 15**. The case will contain all information submitted by the presenting institution. Discussants should review the case as submitted to determine that all tests and results mentioned in the case

have been submitted. It will be the responsibility of the Discussant to notify Foundation staff of missing items within ten days of receipt. The case will be sent directly to the address preference submitted on the application.

The Faculty Discussant will be required to prepare a differential diagnosis and speculate on the final diagnosis and disposition of the case. He or she will have 30 days to solve the case, prepare the required PowerPoint presentation and submit the final presentation to the Foundation by **September 15**. Changes in the presentation received after that date will not be incorporated.

Presentation Format

Resident Presenters will be allocated ten (10) minutes to present their case, without revealing the final diagnosis. Presentations may include a description of the history and physical examination, presenting findings and tests ordered.

Faculty Discussants will be allocated fifteen (15) minutes to present their findings leading to the solution and speculated diagnosis of the case.

The Resident Presenter will return to the podium for a five (5) minute presentation that will reveal the final diagnosis and disposition of the case.

Awards

Resident Presenters and Faculty Discussants will be judged separately, identifying the top three presentations in each area. The top three Resident Presenters and top three Faculty Discussants will receive monetary awards of \$500, \$250, and \$125, respectively.

Additionally, all winning Resident Presenters will receive paid admission to the Foundation's Gala (held at the ACOEP Scientific Assembly) at which time they will receive an award denoting their winning status. Travel expenses will not be provided to this function.

CPC Judging Criteria

Resident presentation scoring

Area	Item	Options	Score
I. Differential Diagnosis			
	A. History		
		Complete pertinent history provided	5
			4
		Partially complete history, no misleading information	3
			2
		Significant omissions or misleading information	1
	B. Examination		
		Complete pertinent examination provided	5

			4
		Partially complete examination, no misleading information	3
			2
		Significant omissions or misleading information	1
C. Emergency Department course			
		Explained any unexpected evolution in the case or no unexpected changes during the ED course	3
			2
		Pertinent information is missing	1
II. Overall Oral/ Visual Presentation			
A. Quality of slides			
		Appropriate text and graphic size, easy to see pertinent information	5
			4
		Text too small or large, graphics blurry but discernable, challenging to see pertinent information	3
			2
		Exceedingly crowded text, unable to discern pertinent information from graphics	1
B. Oratory skills			
		Interesting to listen to, uses appropriate terminology	5
			4
		Somewhat monotonous, occasionally uses technical terms inappropriately	3
			2
		Extremely monotonous or frequent misuse of technical terms	1
C. Time management (separate from penalty for exceeding allowed time)			
		Appropriate pace and cadence	3
		Somewhat rushed or drawn out, advances slides somewhat fast	2
		Exceedingly rushed or drawn out, advances key slides too fast to obtain necessary information	1
III. Appropriate Studies Provided			
A. Data provided			
		Complete, appropriate studies provided	10
			9
			8
		Partial studies provided, key items present, no misleading information	7
			6
			5
		Partial studies provided, key items incomplete, no misleading information	4
			3
			2
		Incomplete studies interfering with making the diagnosis, intentionally misleading information is provided	1
B. Additional data			

		Resident adds pertinent withheld data in the summary and discussion	-2
		Resident did not withhold pertinent data	0
IV. Case Solvability/ Fairness			
A. Quality of case			
		High quality case, intriguing	5
			4
		Good case, interesting	3
			2
		Poor case, simple or straightforward diagnosis	1
B. Solvability			
		Challenging but solvable	5
			4
		Solvable	3
			2
		Not solvable or "give-away" diagnosis	1
C. Relevance to the practice of Emergency Medicine			
		Clearly demonstrated relevance to Emergency Medicine practice	3
			2
		Did not demonstrate relevance to Emergency Medicine practice	1
D. Final Diagnosis			
		Resident's rationale for the final diagnosis was well supported	5
			4
		Resident's rationale for the final diagnosis was not well supported or the Resident did not provide a rationale for the diagnosis but the Resident and Faculty agree on the diagnosis	3
			2
		Resident and Faculty disagree on the final diagnosis and the Faculty's rationale is superior to the Resident's	1
E. Fairness			
		Diagnosis can be made by reasoning with available information and without studies not routinely done or available in the ED	5
			4
		Studies are needed to make the diagnosis that are beyond the capability of the ED (e.g. PET scan, fungal culture, etc.)	3
			2
		Impossible to reasonably come to the diagnosis without additional information (e.g. findings only seen on post-mortem examination, tissue pathology, etc.)	1

Faculty presentation scoring

Faculty discussants will be evaluated on the following categories: differential diagnosis, overall oral/visual presentation, discussion/decision making, and diagnosis (in context of solvability).

Oral Abstract Competition

The Foundation's Oral Abstract Competition is scheduled annually during the Scientific Assembly of the American College of Osteopathic Emergency Physicians held in the fall. The Competition focuses on residents who have performed research during the most recently completed academic year.

To participate, residents and/or fellows meeting criteria described in the General Guidelines must submit a completed application describing their research, by the submission deadline of **July 31** annually. Applications received after this deadline will be returned to the institution. The application is found in the Application Section of this Handbook.

The application and accompanying research will be evaluated for its pertinence to emergency medicine and validity. If accepted, the resident will be notified within 30 days of the deadline date and be requested to submit a PowerPoint presentation containing the following information:

Abstract: This will provide the context for the study, its purpose, procedures utilized, main findings and conclusions. It should highlight new and important outcomes of the study or observation. All abstracts must reflect the accuracy of the research reported and be of no more than 500 words in length.

Research Study Abstract Format

Title - The title should reflect and concisely describe your research project.

Authors - Include authors name, degree and institutional affiliation

Introduction/Background - Why is the topic you have selected a problem that needs to be addressed? What is missing from the field of study that your study is going to address? Provide a one-sentence summary of the rationale for the study question.

Objective(s) - What does this study intend to resolve? Provide a one-sentence description (eg, "To determine...", "To establish...") of the study's primary objective. Authors may choose to include key secondary objectives.

Methods - A short paragraph discussing the design, setting, patients, and interventions (Refer to the descriptions below). This section describes how the study was carried out.

Design - A statement of the study's basic design (eg, randomized controlled trial, double-blind, cohort, survey, cost-effectiveness analysis). Note: Make sure you include in the design statement a notation that the research study was approved by the IRB (institutional review board)

Setting - A one-sentence description of the clinical circumstances of the setting (eg, general community, primary care center, hospitalized care).

Patients (or other participants) - A brief description of the key eligibility criteria of the study's participants. The total number of the participants must be included and how many participants were included in each group of the study (ie study group(s), control group).

Interventions—A brief description of any interventions administered. (e.g. OMM, medications, etc.)

Main Outcome Measure(s) - A brief description of the study's outcome measurements. (e.g. blood pressure, symptom scores, patient satisfaction scales)

Results - A brief summary of the main results along with declarations and explanations of any important findings. Authors should include the study's relevant statistical information (e.g. confidence intervals, levels of statistical significance).

Conclusion - How does this study add to the body of knowledge on the topic? Provide a brief summary of the study's conclusions directly supported by the reported evidence. Authors may include clinical applications and any recommendations for additional study.

Presentation Format

Presenters will be allocated a total of ten (10) minutes for their presentation. Seven (7) minutes will be allocated to present the PowerPoint presentation based on the following:

1. An introduction explaining the question, problem or treatment on which the research was based.
2. The investigative methods utilized.
3. Data, tables and figures validating and supporting the research findings.
4. Discussion of the research findings.
5. References.

The remaining 2 -3 minute period will be allocated for the presenter to answer questions from the audience and judges.

Awards

Utilizing the Judging Criteria described in the section titled, **Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines**, The judges will evaluate Resident Presenters and identify the top three presentations. The top three presentations will receive monetary awards of \$500, \$250, and \$125, respectively.

Additionally, all winning Resident Presenters will receive paid admission to the Foundation’s Gala (held at the ACOEP Scientific Assembly) at which time they will receive an award denoting their winning status. Travel expenses will not be provided to this function.

Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines

Paper Number:	Title:	Reviewer(s):	Date:			Individual Metric Score	Total Score
Title descriptive of study	No	Some agreement	Accurate Title				
Score 1:	1	2	3				
Research question/Hypothesis	Vague/poorly defined question	Some question definition- at least 2 components of PICO (patient/intervention/comparison/out come)	Well-developed question- meets all components of PICO criteria	Exceptional- meets all PICO criteria, also relevant—passes the "so-what" test			
Score 2:	1	2	3	4			
Originality	Many similar studies	Some innovation	Innovative study	Unique approach			
Score 3:	1	2	3	4			
Study Design	Unable to answer study	Partially addresses question	Good design, addresses question	Excellent design-answers questions and also addresses confounding variables			
Score 4:	1	2	3	4			
Statistical Analysis	None	Inappropriate or inaccurate	Descriptive statistics only	Full statistical analysis			
Score 5:	1	2	3	4			
Data Presentation	Raw data	Data summary	Comparative data present	Detailed analysis			
Score 6:	1	2	3	4			
Tables/Graphs	None	Confusing or inaccurate	Basic	Visually interesting and innovate			
Score 7:	1	2	3	4			
Conclusion Support	Unsupported or inaccurate	Incomplete data support	Some support	Supported			
Score 8:	1	2	3	4			
Discussion of Limitations	None	Incomplete	Complete				
Score 9:	1	2	3				

Impact	Poor	Supports current practice	Stimulates further work	Practice changing			
Score 10 :	1	2	3	4			
References	Minimal	Limited	Comprehensive				
Score 11	1	2	3				
Level of Evidence	RCT interventional study with adequate power, OR systematic review of Level 1 studies, OR prospective diagnostic study applied "gold standard", OR economic study with appropriate sources and analyses, OR appropriately designed & executed basic science study	RCT of low power (< 80% follow up, no blinding, improperly randomized) OR prospective comparative data, OR retrospective study, OR systematic review of Level 2 studies, or economic analysis based on limited data, OR appropriately designed basic science study but limited data	Case controlled study, retrospective comparative study, OR systematic review of Level III studies, OR economic analysis but poor estimates, OR adequately powered but slightly flawed basic science study, OR cohort study without "gold-standard"	Case series without controls, OR poorly designed economic analysis, OR inadequately powered flawed basic science study	Expert Opinion		
LOA modifier	1.3	1.2	1.1	1	1		
Reviewer comments/ feedback						TOTAL OF INDIVIDUAL METRICS =	Total Score (metric x LOE) =

Resident Research Paper Competition

The Foundation's Resident Research Paper Competition is held annually during the Scientific Assembly of the American College of Osteopathic Emergency Physicians in the fall. As the Foundation's most prestigious event recognizing major research conducted during the resident's postdoctoral training program. Residents entering their papers in this competition will have their papers evaluated by a nationwide panel of physician-researchers who will select up to three papers which will be recognized for this award.

The Foundation reserves the right to withhold these annual awards, if the panel of judges deems the quality of the papers insufficient or lacking in substance significant enough to grant the award.

Requirements

1. Eligible participants will meet the criteria described in the General Guidelines (page 4) and research must have been completed by the end of their residency or fellowship program.
2. Research entries are limited to one paper per author. Papers with multiple resident or fellow authors may be submitted; however, all prizes will be split between authors and only one author will be identified as the presenting author.
3. Applications for this award must be received by July 31 annually.
4. Winning authors will be notified by September 1 annually and will be required to attend the Competition personally, if unable to attend the award will be presented, however monetary awards will be withheld.
5. Winning author(s) will be required to submit a PowerPoint presentation as described in the General Requirements on pages 4-5 by September 15. No changes will be accepted after that time.

Paper Submission Format

Papers submitted for review will contain the following elements:

1. **Title Page:** This will contain all information in the title to retrieve the article electronically, including author names and affiliations, disclaimers and sources of financial or other support if any, that facilitated the research.
-

2. **Abstract:** This will provide the context for the study, its purpose, procedures utilized, main findings and conclusions. It should highlight new and important outcomes of the study or observation. All abstracts must reflect the accuracy of the research reported and be of no more than 500 words in length.

Research Study Abstract Format

Title - The title should reflect and concisely describe your research project.

Authors - Include authors name, degree and institutional affiliation

Introduction/Background - Why is the topic you have selected a problem that needs to be addressed? What is missing from the field of study that your study is going to address? Provide a one-sentence summary of the rationale for the study question.

Objective(s) - What does this study intend to resolve? Provide a one-sentence description (eg, "To determine...", "To establish...") of the study's primary objective. Authors may choose to include key secondary objectives.

Methods - A short paragraph discussing the design, setting, patients, and interventions (Refer to the descriptions below). This section describes how the study was carried out.

Design - A statement of the study's basic design (eg, randomized controlled trial, double-blind, cohort, survey, cost-effectiveness analysis). Note: Make sure you include in the design statement a notation that the research study was approved by the IRB (institutional review board)

Setting - A one-sentence description of the clinical circumstances of the setting (eg, general community, primary care center, hospitalized care).

Patients (or other participants) - A brief description of the key eligibility criteria of the study's participants. The total number of the participants must be included and how many participants were included in each group of the study (ie study group(s), control group).

Interventions—A brief description of any interventions administered. (e.g. OMM, medications, etc.)

Main Outcome Measure(s) - A brief description of the study's outcome measurements. (e.g. blood pressure, symptom scores, patient satisfaction scales)

Results - A brief summary of the main results along with declarations and explanations of any important findings. Authors should include the study's relevant statistical information (e.g. confidence intervals, levels of statistical significance).

Conclusion - How does this study add to the body of knowledge on the topic? Provide

- a brief summary of the study's conclusions directly supported by the reported evidence. Authors may include clinical applications and any recommendations for additional study.
3. **Introduction:** This will provide the background for the study, stating its objective or hypothesis.
 4. **Methods Section:** This section will describe the selection of the participants, including eligibility and exclusion criteria and should explain how and why the researcher chose the method. The methods, apparatus, and procedures should be described in sufficient detail to provide other researchers wishing to reproduce the results the ability to do so. Statistical methods should be described clearly to provide the reader with access to the data to verify the results of the study. All computer software and programs should be identified in this section.
 5. **Results:** This section should clearly explain the results in a logical sequence utilizing text, tables and illustrations to illustrate the most important findings first. All data presented in the tables and figures should be repeated in the text of the paper. Main observations should be summarized in this section.
 6. **Discussion:** This section focuses on the new and important aspects of the study and its conclusion. It should link conclusions to the research goals, but avoid unqualified statements and conclusions not supported by the study data.
 7. **References:** This section should include references to original research sources that are directly linked to this research, if possible. A small number of references to key work are usually sufficient.
 8. **Tables:** Tables supporting the research data should be included and numbered sequentially as they appear in the text. Each table should have a brief title and explanatory information placed in footnotes, not in the heading.
 9. **Illustrations or Figures:** Illustrations and/or Figures should be professionally presented as should photographs or laboratory data. Each should be numbered sequentially as they appear in the text and have a brief explanation under the figure or illustration. These should be identified in such fashion as "**Fig 1: explanation.**"

For further detailed instructions and the latest revisions for biomedical manuscript preparation please go to <http://www.lcmje.org>

Awards

Utilizing the Judging Criteria described in the section titled, **Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines**, judges will evaluate Resident Research Papers, identifying the top three papers submitted in the academic year. However, it should be noted that the Foundation reserves the right to withhold or combine any award should it deem that sufficient suitable research has not been submitted that warrant the presentation of this prize. If awarded, the top three monetary awards will amount to a total of \$3500. Typically, first place receives \$2000, second price receives \$1000, and third place receives \$500.

All winning presenters will receive paid admission to the Foundation’s Gala (held at the ACOEP Scientific Assembly) at which time they will receive an award denoting their winning status. Travel expenses will not be provided to this function.

Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines

Paper Number:	Title:	Reviewer(s):	Date:			Individual Metric Score	Total Score
Title descriptive of study	No	Some agreement	Accurate Title				
Score 1:	1	2	3				
Research question/Hypothesis	Vague/poorly defined question	Some question definition- at least 2 components of PICO (patient/intervention/comparison/out come)	Well-developed question- meets all components of PICO criteria	Exceptional- meets all PICO criteria, also relevant—passes the "so-what" test			
Score 2:	1	2	3	4			
Originality	Many similar studies	Some innovation	Innovative study	Unique approach			
Score 3:	1	2	3	4			
Study Design	Unable to answer study	Partially addresses question	Good design, addresses question	Excellent design-answers questions and also addresses confounding variables			
Score 4:	1	2	3	4			
Statistical Analysis	None	Inappropriate or inaccurate	Descriptive statistics only	Full statistical analysis			
Score 5:	1	2	3	4			
Data Presentation	Raw data	Data summary	Comparative data present	Detailed analysis			
Score 6:	1	2	3	4			
Tables/Graphs	None	Confusing or inaccurate	Basic	Visually interesting and innovate			
Score 7:	1	2	3	4			
Conclusion Support	Unsupported or inaccurate	Incomplete data support	Some support	Supported			
Score 8:	1	2	3	4			
Discussion of Limitations	None	Incomplete	Complete				
Score 9:	1	2	3				

Impact	Poor	Supports current practice	Stimulates further work	Practice changing			
Score 10 :	1	2	3	4			
References	Minimal	Limited	Comprehensive				
Score 11	1	2	3				
Level of Evidence	RCT interventional study with adequate power, OR systematic review of Level I studies, OR prospective diagnostic study applied "gold standard", OR economic study with appropriate sources and analyses, OR appropriately designed & executed basic science study	RCT of low power (< 80% follow up, no blinding, improperly randomized), OR prospective comparative data, OR retrospective study, OR systematic review of Level 2 studies, or economic analysis based on limited data, OR appropriately designed basic science study but limited data	Case controlled study, retrospective comparative study, OR systematic review of Level III studies, OR economic analysis but poor estimates, OR adequately powered but slightly flawed basic science study, OR cohort study without "gold-standard"	Case series without controls, OR poorly designed economic analysis, OR inadequately powered flawed basic science study	Expert Opinion		
LOA modifier	1.3	1.2	1.1	1	1		
Reviewer comments/ feedback						TOTAL OF INDIVIDUAL METRICS =	Total Score (metric x LOE) =

Resident Research Poster Competition

The Foundation's Resident Research Poster Competition is scheduled annually during the Scientific Assembly of the American College of Osteopathic Emergency Physicians (ACOEP).

The competition is open to residents and students who have completed a case research in an emergency medicine-related area during the most recently completed postdoctoral training year for residents or during an emergency medicine rotation for students. Interested residents and students must apply for the competition utilizing the specific form found later in this document or on the Foundation's website. If selected, the participant will present the results of their study findings to an audience of physicians.

Competition Format

Accepted Posters will be placed on digital displayed for a specific time prior to the beginning of the competition. During this time, conference participants will be allowed to view the poster prior to the presentation period.

Each presenter will be assigned a time frame in which they will present their poster to an audience of physicians and their peers. Posters will be digitally displayed in an interactive forum with a variety of presenters presenting simultaneously. Presenters will be expected to present their poster and answer questions multiple times within their presentation time frame. Judges will make rounds to each poster presenter in the room and judge the presenter on the poster content and presentation. At the end of the presentations, judges will adjourn to discuss their grading of the posters.

Photos of winning posters and presenters will be placed on the Foundation's website for a period of time and recognition will be placed on the website and noted to the winner's institution.

Competition Requirements

All entries must be submitted on the designated form, found on the Foundation's website or at the end of this document by **July 31 annually**. Entries received after this date will not be accepted.

All entries must include an abstract as a writeable Word® document (.doc) of 500 words or less.

All applicants will be notified of their acceptance or non-acceptance by the Foundation via email by **August 30** annually. Accepted applicants will be provided with the dates for display and judging and provided with a poster number.

Participants must be at their poster to present their case to judges. Posters will be visited by judges in numerical order. Failure to be at your poster and prepared to discuss your poster will mean automatic disqualification.

Abstract: This will provide the context for the study, its purpose, procedures utilized, main findings and conclusions. It should highlight new and important outcomes of the study or observation. All abstracts must reflect the accuracy of the research reported and be of no more than 500 words in length.

Research Study Abstract Format

Title - The title should reflect and concisely describe your research project.

Authors - Include authors name, degree and institutional affiliation

Introduction/Background - Why is the topic you have selected a problem that needs to be addressed? What is missing from the field of study that your study is going to address? Provide a one-sentence summary of the rationale for the study question.

Objective(s) - What does this study intend to resolve? Provide a one-sentence description (eg, "To determine...", "To establish...") of the study's primary objective. Authors may choose to include key secondary objectives.

Methods - A short paragraph discussing the design, setting, patients, and interventions (Refer to the descriptions below). This section describes how the study was carried out.

Design - A statement of the study's basic design (eg, randomized controlled trial, double-blind, cohort, survey, cost-effectiveness analysis). Note: Make sure you include in the design statement a notation that the research study was approved by the IRB (institutional review board)

Setting - A one-sentence description of the clinical circumstances of the setting (eg, general community, primary care center, hospitalized care).

Patients (or other participants) - A brief description of the key eligibility

criteria of the study's participants. The total number of the participants must be included and how many participants were included in each group of the study (ie study group(s), control group).

Interventions—A brief description of any interventions administered. (e.g. OMM, medications, etc.)

Main Outcome Measure(s) - A brief description of the study's outcome measurements. (e.g. blood pressure, symptom scores, patient satisfaction scales)

Results - A brief summary of the main results along with declarations and explanations of any important findings. Authors should include the study's relevant statistical information (e.g. confidence intervals, levels of statistical significance).

Conclusion - How does this study add to the body of knowledge on the topic? Provide a brief summary of the study's conclusions directly supported by the reported evidence. Authors may include clinical applications and any recommendations for additional study.

Poster Format

Posters must be supplied as a one-page PowerPoint presentation in widescreen (16:9) orientation. No physical posters should be printed or transported, as FOEM competitions are 100% digital.

1. An introduction explaining the question, problem or treatment on which the research was based.
2. The investigative methods utilized.
3. Data, tables and figures validating and supporting the research findings.
4. Discussion of the research findings.
5. References.

Posters not meeting these criteria will have points deducted at the time of judging.

Research Poster Awards

The top three poster presenters will receive a written certificate, suitable for framing, from the Foundation and monetary awards of \$500, \$250, and \$125, respectively. Additionally, all presenters will receive paid admission to the Foundation's Gala (held at the ACOEP Scientific Assembly) at which time they will receive an award denoting their winning status. Travel expenses will not be provided to this function.

Abstracts from these poster presentations will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, e.g., WestJEM, JAOA, or the Foundation's annual research publication, The Research Beacon. While the Foundation cannot ensure publication, we will endeavor to have these

published.

Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines

Paper Number:	Title:	Reviewer(s):	Date:		Individual Metric Score	Total Score
Title descriptive of study	No	Some agreement	Accurate Title			
Score 1:	1	2	3			
Research question/Hypothesis	Vague/poorly defined question	Some question definition- at least 2 components of PICO (patient/intervention/comparison/out come)	Well-developed question- meets all components of PICO criteria	Exceptional- meets all PICO criteria, also relevant-passes the "so-what" test		
Score 2:	1	2	3	4		
Originality	Many similar studies	Some innovation	Innovative study	Unique approach		
Score 3:	1	2	3	4		
Study Design	Unable to answer study	Partially addresses question	Good design, addresses question	Excellent design-answers questions and also addresses confounding variables		
Score 4:	1	2	3	4		
Statistical Analysis	None	Inappropriate or inaccurate	Descriptive statistics only	Full statistical analysis		
Score 5:	1	2	3	4		
Data Presentation	Raw data	Data summary	Comparative data present	Detailed analysis		
Score 6:	1	2	3	4		
Tables/Graphs	None	Confusing or inaccurate	Basic	Visually interesting and innovate		
Score 7:	1	2	3	4		
Conclusion Support	Unsupported or inaccurate	Incomplete data support	Some support	Supported		
Score 8:	1	2	3	4		
Discussion of Limitations	None	Incomplete	Complete			
Score 9:	1	2	3			

Impact	Poor	Supports current practice	Stimulates further work	Practice changing			
Score 10 :	1	2	3	4			
References	Minimal	Limited	Comprehensive				
Score 11	1	2	3				
Level of Evidence	RCT interventional study with adequate power, OR systematic review of Level I studies, OR prospective diagnostic study applied "gold standard", OR economic study with appropriate sources and analyses, OR appropriately designed & executed basic science study	RCT of low power (< 80% follow up, no blinding, improperly randomized), OR prospective comparative data, OR retrospective study, OR systematic review of Level 2 studies, or economic analysis based on limited data, OR appropriately designed basic science study but limited data	Case controlled study, retrospective comparative study, OR systematic review of Level III studies, OR economic analysis but poor estimates, OR adequately powered but slightly flawed basic science study, OR cohort study without "gold-standard"	Case series without controls, OR poorly designed economic analysis, OR inadequately powered flawed basic science study	Expert Opinion		
LOA modifier	1.3	1.2	1.1	1	1		
Reviewer comments/ feedback						TOTAL OF INDIVIDUAL METRICS =	Total Score (metric x LOE) =

