

APPENDIX 1

PROCESS FOR REVIEW OF ABSTRACTS

Scientific Program Committee

The process of culling abstracts will be co-ordinated by the ANZSCOS scientific officer. Each abstract will be independently marked by two appropriately qualified people nominated by the ANZSCOS ASM Sub-Committee and the ANZSCOS scientific officer. All assessors will use a standardised scoring sheet and scoring system (devised by the Brisbane ANZSCOS organising committees). See Appendices 1-7.

The Scientific Program Committee should consist of at least 3 members, usually from different disciplines but including the ANZSCoS Scientific Officer. Members responsible for culling the research submissions must have post-graduate training in research design.

Abstract Review Process

All abstracts should be reviewed independently by two of the Committee and scored according to Overall Quality (Graded 1-10) and Presentation Type.

Presentation types are: 1) Scientific / Research, 2) Service Developments / Initiatives, 3) Quality / Evidence-based Practice Projects and 4) Other e.g. Literature Reviews. There may be some overlap in these categories. These categories may be used by the Organising Committee to group "like presentations" into the Scientific Program.

Reviewers also independently classify each abstract as being more suitable for an Oral or a Poster presentation, giving consideration to the request made by the submitting author.

Reviewers should not review papers on which they were an author. Ideally, the reviewers should be blinded to the authors of abstracts.

A total score for each paper is obtained by adding the scores of each reviewer. Abstracts where there is a significant discrepancy in scores between reviewers or differences in opinion regarding whether it should be an oral or poster presentation should be referred to the third reviewer for an independent opinion - thus a majority opinion could be reached.

Abstracts submitted greater than 1 month (or other appropriate time decided by the SPC) after the Closing Date should not be considered for "Oral" presentations.

While the Committee should make effort to accommodate the specific requests of all submitting authors, it is acknowledged that this will not always be possible.

APPENDIX 2

Abstract Review Form – Review Team B (Service development/quality)

	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Classification Code (A – B)	Presentation Type Code O or P	Notes
	Quality Score	Quality Score	Quality Score			
Paper No.						

Notes:

1. Quality Score 1-10 with 1 being the lowest.
2. Classification code
 - a = Research Paper (Scientific Method and Outcomes, may be Quantitative or Qualitative)
 - b = Service Developments / Quality Initiatives
3. Presentation type
 - P= Poster
 - O = Oral

APPENDIX 3

Abstract Review Form – Review Team A (Scientific papers)

	Reviewer 1 Quality Score	Reviewer 2 Quality Score	Reviewer 3 Quality Score	Classification Code (A – B)	Presentation Type Code O or P	Notes
Paper No.						

Notes:

- 1. Quality Score 1-10 with 1 being the lowest.
- 2. Classification code
 - a = Research Paper (Scientific Method and Outcomes, may be Quantitative or Qualitative)
 - b = Service Developments / Quality Initiatives
- 3. Presentation type
 - P= Poster
 - O = Oral

APPENDIX 4

Abstract Review Results Form

Paper No.	Reviewer 1 Quality Score	Reviewer 2 Quality Score	Reviewer 3 Quality Score	Classification Code (A – C)	Presentation Type Code	Quality Score Total
1	5	5		Poster	A	10
2	5	4		Oral	A	9
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						

	Reviewer 1 Quality Score	Reviewer 2 Quality Score	Reviewer 3 Quality Score	Classification Code (A – C)	Presentation Type Code	Quality Score Total
50						
51						
52						
53						
54						
55						
56						
57						
58						
59						
60						

Instructions / Notes:

1. **Quality Score** – please score each Abstract on a scale of 1-10.
2. **Classification Code** – please indicate whether the paper is suitable for A = Oral presentation, B = Poster presentation, C = Neither / Declined
3. **Presentation Type**
 - a = **Research Paper** (Scientific Method and Outcomes, may be Quantitative or Qualitative)
 - b = **Service Developments / Initiatives**
 - c = **Quality / EBP Projects**
 - d = **Other** e.g. Literature Reviews etc
4. **Quality Score Total** – The total of each reviewers quality score.
5. **Shaded boxes indicate Abstracts to be reviewed by each reviewer**

APPENDIX 5

Scoring schema

2 prizes awarded for the best poster presentations

Objective:

- To award prizes to new investigators as encouragement
- To recognise achievement in content, presentation, clarity, and relevance to the broader objectives of the conference

Categories:

- Research
- Service Development and Quality improvement
NB excluded-well known presenters/ PHDs etc

Process: 2 judges independent and then conferring. Max score 10

CONTENT/QUALITY (C) Max possible mark = 4	PRESENTATION (P) Max possible mark = 3	RELEVANCE (R) Max possible mark = 3
4 - OUTSTANDING Suitable for publication in international peer reviewed journal	3 - OUTSTANDING- Perfect presentation of information with excellent use of visual material and/or auditory aspects, which compel the listener/reader to attend	3 - IMPORTANT Concepts extremely relevant to the audience with potential to change the way people think
3 - HIGH STANDARD Rigorous scientific or quality methods employed which are well articulated in the presentation	2 - HIGH STANDARD Good presentation covering the key issues well and maintains interest of audience	2 - WORTHWHILE Concepts relevant to the audience with application to aspects of spinal cord injury management
2 - COMPETENT A compelling presentation in which there are minor inconsistencies/concerns in the argument or in which the argument fails to present or correctly interpret some relevant data or experiences.	1 - LIMITED Limited ability to convey the key messages well	1 - LIMITED Not specifically relevant and unlikely to influence or change people's thinking
1 - LIMITED Assigned to a presentation in which there are many minor inconsistencies/concerns or one substantial inconsistency		

