

## Abstract Judging Criteria *(Clinical/Community/Basic Science Study)*

<b>Background and Objective:</b>	Was the objective of the study (research question, specific aim) stated clearly?
<b>Patients and Methods:</b>	Was the research design of the study clearly delineated? Was there a comparison group? If so, were the treatment groups clearly described? Was blinding involved? If a retrospective study, were the institution and inclusive years of the review identified? Was the primary outcome variable identified as such? Were all the secondary outcomes of interest addressed? Where appropriate, were the outcome variables defined (i.e., if the outcome variable was sepsis, did the authors provide a definition of sepsis)? Were methods of data analysis described, and appropriate?
<b>Results and Conclusions:</b>	Were the results and conclusions accurately and concisely presented? Were the total number of patients and, where it applies, the number of patients in each treatment group, described (sometimes this is spelled out in the Methods section)?
<b>Originality:</b>	Did the study employ unique techniques or methods? Did it use accepted methodologies and techniques in a new way? Was the research hypothesis novel or unique?

### RATING SCALE

<b>(5) Excellent</b>	Excellent in every way. Holy cow, what an unbelievably amazing abstract! Yow!
<b>(4) Very Good</b>	Above average. Really nice job by the authors, with no tweaking required.
<b>(3) Good</b>	Satisfactory or average abstract. Acceptable as is, with perhaps some tweaking to address some minor points. Most abstracts will fall in this category.
<b>(2) Marginal</b>	Below average abstract. This would need considerable additional work to correct deficiencies.
<b>(1) Poor</b>	Well below average abstract. This would require a complete rewrite, preferably with editorial assistance.