Society for Academic Emergency Medicine

SAEM Abstract Scoring Rubric

1. Clarity of Objectives—Reviewers prioritize studies with clear objectives (whether descriptive or hypothesis testing).

0 = No stated objective
1 = Poorly chosen or ambiguous objective(s)
2 = Clear, well thought out objective(s) that logically follow from the background information

2. Appropriateness of methods- Reviewers prioritize studies that use the right research methods for the scientific question.

0 = Inappropriate methods for objective(s)
1 = Chosen methods were sub-optimal, but did address the objective(s)
2 = Chosen methods were the best feasible for the objective(s) (i.e. rigorous methods)

3. Outcome(s)

0 = Chosen outcomes are inappropriate for study objective
1 = Chosen outcomes are reasonable for study objective, but not the best measure
2 = Chosen outcomes are ideal for study objective

4. Data analysis- Reviewers prioritize studies that use statistics correctly

	Quantitative	Qualitative
0	No analysis described or inappropriate data analysis for study objectives/design	No analysis described or inappropriate data analysis for study objectives/design
1	Some data analysis performed but either inappropriate statistical test for study design, or statistical not interpreted accurately	Some description of data analyses, but not entirely clear
2	Data analysis is clear, appropriate statistical test applied for study design and accurately interpreted	In depth description of systematic data analyses appropriate to study objective with clear description of how themes and concepts were derived

5. Generalizability-The ability to be applicable and reproducible

	General	Medical Education	Clinical Trial/Observational Studies	Basic Science
0	Results are only applicable to a very specific population/setting	Applicable to only a very specific population or setting	Small number of enrollments for common disease	Methods invalid with highly unlikely reproducibility
1	Results are applicable to most EM population/settings	Applicable to educators in emergency medicine	Large multicentered trial with adequate enrollment or high enrollment at limited number of sites	Methods valid with some questioning of reproducibility
2	Results are applicable to all of EM populations/settings	Applicable to educators beyond emergency medicine	Large multicentered trial with proper enrollment for outcome	Methods valid with results that would be able to be reproduced

6. Relevance and importance

0 = This topic is only of interest to a very small group of people and is unlikely to result in important knowledge

1 = This topic is essential to emergency medicine and is likely to be important and relevant for all of emergency medicine

2 = This topic is essential to other specialties beyond emergency medicine

7. Innovation of study- Reviewers prioritize topics of major importance to large numbers of emergency medicine researchers or clinicians

	General	Medical Education	Clinical Trial/Observational Studies	Basic Science	Survey
0	Not innovative or Novel	Traditional method of instruction without new area/environment	Re-examination of already proven knowledge (i.e. trial re-examining PERC rule in the same population)	Already established pathway, disease model, or method	Traditional survey tool with low response rate (<60%)
1	Moderately innovative	New method of instructing in a standard environment or standard instructional method in a novel area/environment	Traditional approach with a novel idea or a New approach with an established method	i.e. traditional approach applied in a different manner, expansion on already known pathway, or model of disease	New survey tool or innovative way to survey with adequate response rate
2	Completely novel Idea	New method of instructing in a novel area/environment	New method of enrollment, approach, or study with a novel idea	i.e. New marker for illness, new pathway elucidated, new model for disease	New method of sampling/tool and high response rate

8. Quality of writing-Does this abstract reflect high-quality writing and attention to detail?

0 = Poorly written, unclear, difficult to understand

1 = Generally well-written

2= Exceptionally well-written, clear, logical organization and presentation of ideas.

9. Strength of conclusion(s)

0 = No clear conclusions can be drawn or conclusions do not follow directly from results

1 = Conclusions are probable based on results
2 = Conclusions are unequivocal

.