Society for Academic Emergency Medicine

Annual Meeting
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 suboptimal, 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 EM	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