



**College of Intensive Care Medicine
of Australia and New Zealand**
ABN: 16 134 292 103

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Document type: | Guidelines |
| Date last reviewed: | 2016 |

GUIDELINES ON ABSTRACT SUBMISSION FOR SHORT PAPER PRESENTATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the requirements for submitting an abstract for Short Paper Presentation category at the College Annual Scientific Meeting.

2. PRESENTATION AT THE ANNUAL SCIENTIFIC MEETING

All applications who wish to present at the Short Paper Presentations at the ASM must adhere to the following:

2.1 Application to present

2.1.1 An abstract must be submitted via the specified online portal. At the completion of the submission process, applicants must confirm they have read and understood the Terms and Conditions outlined on the ASM Website: Abstract Submission Page.

2.1.2 An appropriate abstract in line with section 3.1

2.1.3 A statement that institutional ethics committee approval has been obtained. This must be included if the work involves human or animal subjects. If no ethics approval is required, this must be clearly documented.

2.1.4 A statement identifying any conflicts of interest. If there are no conflicts of interest, this must be clearly documented.

2.1.5 A brief statement outlining the contribution of the authors to the design and conduct of the study and writing of the report.

3. ABSTRACTS

All applications who wish to present at the Short Presentations at the ASM must adhere to the following:

3.1 Requirements

3.1.1 Abstracts must be written in English and should contain no more than 250 words (not including titles).

3.1.2 Abstracts must be submitted via the specified online portal in Word format; Arial font 11 point, single spaced, no underlines and bold type. Convert all documents to pdf before submitting.

3.1.3 The abstract heading must contain the title in BLOCK CAPITALS and have one line space prior to text commencement.

3.1.4 The title should be precise so that it conveys the main message of the study.

3.1.5 Abstracts should contain brief but complete statements of introduction, objectives, methods & settings, results and conclusion.

3.1.6 Abstract must be written in past tense.

3.1.7 The Abstract must contain sufficient information so that when it is published in the proceedings or a scientific journal, it will be a complete report independent of the presentation. The text should not contain statements alluding to results or conclusions not presented in the text: abstracts stating “*will be discussed*”, “*will be described*”, or “*will be presented*” will be rejected.

3.1.8 Only standard abbreviations should be used. In general, no more than two non-standard abbreviations should be used. Use SI units except for pressure, using cmH₂O or mmHg with kPa in brackets.

3.1.9 A maximum of two references and one figure (**either a simple graph or a table**) may be included.

3.1.10 Simple tables are acceptable but graphs, diagrams and complex tables are not accepted.

3.1.11 Abstracts accepted for presentation will be printed in the ASM Handbook.

3.2 Assessment Criteria

3.2.1 Reviewing the abstracts will be carried out online by at least two members of the local organising committee. The score assigned to each abstract will be the average of the reviewers' scores with major disagreements between scores resolved through discussion between the reviewers and may include input from a third reviewer.

3.2.2 Abstracts which receive the highest scores will be given the opportunity to present, which will be reviewed using the Review Criteria outlined in Appendix 1.

3.2.3 Each of the submitted abstracts will be assessed using the criteria outlined in the scoring grid. The criteria is based on the [STROBE statement conference abstract checklist](#), the [CONSORT abstract checklist](#) and the [ARRIVE checklist](#). Where a study uses a different methodology to that described in these checklists, the abstract will be assessed with reference to the major headings outlined in 3.4.

4 . ASM ADJUDICATION PANEL

The Adjudication Panel is responsible for awarding the best presentation during the ASM.

4.1 An adjudication panel will be selected from the Board, ASM Committee and experienced Fellows to adjudicate the Short Paper Presentations.

4.2 The panel will consist of 2 Adjudicators for the Short Paper Presentations.

4.3 The Adjudication Panel will use the assessment criteria outlined in Appendix 2.

4.4 If, in the opinion of the adjudicators, no presentation attains a sufficiently high standard, an award will not be presented for that category.



ABSTRACT REVIEW CRITERIA

Appendix 1: Review Criteria – Short Paper Submissions.

| Review Criteria | Score |
|---|--------------|
| <p>Title: 5 marks</p> <p>Provides a title that indicates the study's design (e.g. randomised, cohort, case-control, cross-sectional, systematic review and meta-analysis, in vitro study, in vivo study etc.).</p> | |
| <p>Objective(s): 10 marks</p> <p>The primary and any secondary objectives of the study are clearly described.</p> | |
| <p>Methods: 15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes the setting where the research was conducted; • Describes eligibility criteria (where applicable); • Describes the trial design in detail (e.g. phase I, phase IIa, phase IIb, parallel groups, cohort, case-control, cross sectional etc); • For pre-clinical studies, describes experimental methodology in clear concise language which is likely to be understood by a general ICU audience; • Uses appropriate methods to achieve the study's stated objectives. | |
| <p>Results: 20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports the number of participants; • Uses appropriate statistical methods; • Reports sufficient information to allow the reader to establish the internal and external validity of the results; • Reports all results stated in the methods as having been assessed. | |
| <p>Originality: 15 marks</p> <p>Marks assigned for originality will include an overall assessment of the originality of the study hypothesis, methods, results, and interpretation, and if known will assign extra merit to work that has been conceived by the trainee themselves.</p> | |
| <p>Context: 5 marks</p> <p>Relevance to the Australian and New Zealand context.</p> | |
| <p>Work performed by the authors: 20 marks</p> <p>For example, a prospective RCT in which the authors have personally enrolled a large number of patients over a year should receive higher marks than a retrospective database review.</p> | |
| <p>Conclusions: 10 marks</p> <p>Provides conclusions which are supported by the results presented and place the results in an appropriate context.</p> | |
| TOTAL SCORE | /100 |

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Appendix 2: Assessment Criteria - Short Paper Presentations

| ASM Assessment of presentation. | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| PRESENTERS NAME: | | | |
| Comprehension & Content Presented | Poor | Good | Excellent |
| 1. Background | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2. Clinical Significance | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 3. Research Methods | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 4. Key Results | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 5. Validity of conclusions | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 6. Consistent with submitted abstract | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| | | | |
| Engagement & Communication | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 7. Clear, well-paced, logical presentation | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 8. Presenter conveyed enthusiasm for topic | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 9. Stage presence, eye contact, vocal range | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 10. Slide clear, legible, and concise | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| | | | |
| TOTAL | / 20 | | |