

2027 SAPC Regional (SE) abstract review criteria for reviewers

The object of peer review is to assess the quality of scholarship and the extent to which the abstract aligns with the conference themes and aims to ensure a high quality programme of presentations and a lively, informative meeting. The conference welcomes interesting, well designed and well conducted work at all stages of development / delivery and reviewers should give equivalent weight to abstracts relating to work-in-progress and completed work.

Peer review process

Reviewers should mark abstracts using the full range of scores stated for each of the criteria. Each criterion has a score range with 1 being the lowest, and higher scores representing higher quality abstracts (e.g. 1=poor, 5=excellent).

A high scoring abstract will:

- identify an important problem (one which responds to a clear gap in the literature; a practice or policy priority; a topic which is fundamental to primary care)
- describe a clear research question and aim
- set out an appropriate study design which is capable of meeting the stated aims
- offer a clear description of methods and methodological approach
- include findings which are trustworthy, or - for work in progress - a compelling conclusion and/or discussion which justifies the approach being taken in the ongoing research

A lower scoring abstract is likely to include poorly focused research that is not highly relevant to primary care or which is poorly designed or executed.

The following areas should be considered when scoring abstracts

1 Importance of the problem or topic

- Is the problem (or topic area) original/important/relevant to academic primary care?
- Are the aims of the study clearly described?

2 The approach (design/methods)

- Is the study design appropriate for the stated research question(s) and aims?
- Are the methods/ methodological approach clearly described? Are the data sources clearly specified? Are the methods, analytical techniques and software tools specified? Are the methods appropriate to the question being investigated?
 - **For qualitative studies:** Are qualitative methods appropriate to answering the research questions/addressing research objectives? Are the recruitment method(s), sample population(s), methods of data collection, and methods of data analyses described and appropriate?
 - **For quantitative, observational experimental or modelling studies:** Are the sample frame(s), sampling method(s), sample population(s), intervention and control conditions, methods of data collection, main outcome measures, assumptions and statistical methods all clear and appropriate?
 - **For mixed methods:** Is there appropriate use of quantitative/qualitative methods, each clearly described, in an order that makes sense, and each appropriately integrated at the right stage of the analysis/interpretation?

- **Systematic reviews:** Should state objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, search strategy (e.g. data/text mining), participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods (e.g. meta-analysis, meta-regression, narrative synthesis, meta-ethnography). Has the risk of bias and quality of the included studies been considered?
- What is the overall quality of the study methods employed (or proposed)?

3. Findings

- Are the key findings clearly described?
- How confident is the reviewer in the strength/trustworthiness of the findings and/or conclusions/discussion presented?
- For work in progress:
 - Are results sufficient to indicate that a sound analysis will be presented at the conference? Abstracts should not say only that 'results will be presented'.
 - How well are plans for progressing the research described?

4. Consequences (significance)

- How important are these research findings?
- How and to what extent are the findings likely to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy?
 - Are the implications for further research spelt out clearly
 - Do authors consider the limitations and strengths of their findings?
 - Will the paper stimulate debate and interest?
- For work in progress:
 - What is the potential of the project to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy?

5. Alignment with conference theme

- In addition reviewers should consider the extent to which the submission aligns with the conference theme: Primary Care Research: Optimising Impact.

SAPC ABSTRACT SCORING SHEET

Name of reviewer.....

Abstract number.....

RATING

(Please circle: 1 = poor, 5 = excellent)

Importance of topic	1	2	3	4	5
The approach	1	2	3	4	5
Findings	1	2	3	4	5
Implications	1	2	3	4	5
Alignment with conference theme	1	2	3	4	5

Overall score/25

SAPC ABSTRACT SCORING SHEET

Name of reviewer.....

Abstract number.....

RATING

(Please circle: 1 = poor, 5 = excellent)

Importance of topic	1	2	3	4	5
The approach	1	2	3	4	5
Findings	1	2	3	4	5
Implications	1	2	3	4	5
Alignment with conference theme	1	2	3	4	5

Overall score/25