



## **Abstract Review Criteria and Reviewer Guidelines**

### **Peer review process**

All submitted abstracts will be reviewed independently by at least two peer reviewers. The review process aims to ensure that submissions meet the criteria for quality, relevance and importance. This is put in place to select the highest quality submissions for the conference program. We welcome interesting, well designed and well conducted work.

Reviewers will mark abstracts using the criteria provided below on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=poor, 2= fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent.

The Conference Committee will only consider completed research for oral presentations.

The Conference Committee will consider both completed research as well as work-in-progress for poster presentations.

### **Oral and Poster abstracts**

Peer reviewers will assess abstracts according to a list of criteria:

#### **1) Importance of the topic**

- Is the topic original/important/relevant to primary care?
- Are the aims of the study clearly described?

#### **2) Design and methods**

- Is the study design appropriate for the research aim(s), hypothesis(es) and question(s)?
- Are the methods clearly described?
- What is the overall quality of the study methods (utilised 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, reviewers will assess the quality of the conclusions/discussion taking into account interim findings/conclusions.*

### **4) Implications (significance)**

- How important are the research findings?
- How and to what extent are the findings likely to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy?

*For work in progress, reviewers will consider the potential of the project to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy.*

## **Workshop abstracts**

Peer reviewers will assess abstracts according to a list of criteria:

### **1) Relevance of topic**

- Is the workshop topic important, interesting and relevant to primary care?

### **2) Objectives**

- Are the objectives of the workshop clear, relevant and achievable?

### **3) Format**

- Is the proposed format of the workshop innovative and likely to provoke discussion and interaction between workshop participants?
- Is there pre-conference reading, brief survey or short assignment relevant and not overly onerous for delegates?