

# Research Poster Competition

## Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines

Name
Title
<b>Total Score</b>

<b>Title Descriptive of study</b>	No	Some agreement	Accurate Title	
<b>Score 1:</b>	1	2	3	
<b>Research Question/Hypothesis</b>	Vague/poorly defined question	Some question definition-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
<b>Score 2:</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Originality</b>	Many similar studies	Some innovation	Innovative Study	Unique Approach
<b>Score 3:</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Study Design</b>	Unable to answer study	Partially addresses question	Good design, addresses question	Excellent design-answers questions and also addresses confounding variables
<b>Score 4:</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Statistical Analysis</b>	None	Inappropriate or inaccurate	Descriptive statistics only	Full statistical analysis
<b>Score 5:</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Data Presentation</b>	Raw data	Data summary	Comparative data present	Detailed analysis
<b>Score 6:</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Tables/Graphs</b>	None	Confusing or inaccurate	Basic	Visually interesting and innovate
<b>Score 7:</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Conclusion Support</b>	Unsupported or inaccurate	Incomplete data support	Some support	Supported
<b>Score 8:</b>	1	2	3	4

<b>Discussion of Limitations</b>	None	Incomplete	Complete	
<b>Score 9:</b>	1	2	3	
<b>Impact</b>	Poor	Supports current practice	Stimulates further work	Practice changing
<b>Score 10:</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>References</b>	Minimal	Limited	Comprehensive	
<b>Score 11:</b>	1	2	3	
<b>Level of Evidence (LOE modifier)</b>	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