

Oral Abstract Competition

Evaluation Criteria & Guidelines

Name
Title
TOTAL SCORE

Title Descriptive of study	No	Some agreement	Accurate Title	
Score 1:	1	2	3	
Research Question/Hypothesis	Vague/poorly defined question	at least 2 components of PICO (Patient/Intervention/Comparison/Outcome)	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	questions and also addresses confounding
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 (LOE modifier)	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.	1.3
	RCT of lower 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.	1.2
	Case controlled study, retrospective comparative study, OR systematic review of Level 3 studies, OR economic analysis but poor estimates, OR adequately powered but slightly flawed basic science study, OR cohort study without "gold-standard"	1.1
	D. Case series without controls, OR poorly designed economic analysis, OR inadequately powered flawed basic science study	1
	E. Expert Opinion	1