



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

Document type:	Guidelines
Date established:	2018

GUIDELINES ON ABSTRACT SUBMISSION FOR FREE PAPER PRESENTATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the requirements for submitting an abstract for Free Paper Presentation category at the College Rural Meeting. All applications who apply to present at the Free Paper Presentations at the Rural Meeting agree to the following:

2. PRESENTATION AT THE RURAL MEETING

- 2.1 Application to present must be made 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 Rural Meeting Website: Abstract Submission Page. Applications must contain:
 - 2.1 An appropriate abstract in line with section 3.1
 - 2.2 A verifiable statement that requisite ethics approval has been obtained or waived. This must be included if the work involves human or animal subjects. If no ethics approval is required, this must be clearly documented.
 - 2.3 A statement identifying any conflicts of interest. If there are no conflicts of interest, this must be clearly documented.
 - 2.4 A brief statement outlining the contribution of the authors to the design and conduct of the study and writing of the report.

3. ABSTRACTS

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 and single spaced. 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 Use standard abbreviations. 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 may be included.

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 Appendix 1.

4. FREE PAPER PRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 There will be two formats of presentation, Long and Lightning. These are not indicators of quality or importance of the topic but reflect the complexity of explanation required.
- 4.2 The same abstract process will apply to all applications.
- 4.3 Each format will be separately adjudicated.
- 4.4 Applicants may indicate their preference in their application. If the reviewing committee believes the presentation to be suitable for presentation but better suited to another format, the applicant will be contacted and that offer made.
- 4.5 Long format presentations are of **20 minutes'** duration including **five minutes'** question time. They are suited to complex topics particularly trainee projects with extensive data, analysis or discussion.
- 4.6 Lightning format presentations are of **8 minutes'** duration including **3 minutes'** question time. They are suited to presenting concepts, single important conclusions and stimulating debate.

5. FREE PAPER ADJUDICATION PANEL

- 5.1 The Adjudication Panel is responsible for awarding the prize for best Free Paper.
- 5.2 An adjudication panel will be selected from the Conference Organising Committee and experienced Fellows to adjudicate the Best Free Paper Presentations.
- 5.3 The panel will consist of 3 Adjudicators for the Free Paper Presentations.
- 5.4 The Adjudication Panel will use the assessment criteria outlined in Appendix 2.
- 5.5 If, in the opinion of the adjudicators, no presentation attains a sufficiently high standard, an award will not be presented for that category.



REVIEW CRITERIA

Appendix 1: Review Criteria – Free Paper Submissions.

Review Criteria	Score
<p>Title and Objective(s): 10 marks The primary and any secondary objectives of the study are clearly described.</p>	
<p>Methods: 10 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 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: 15 marks Relevance to the Australian and New Zealand context. Relevance / Applicability to regional and rural critical care Potential to positively impact on the care or inclusion of Indigenous (especially Aboriginal, Torres Strait Island or Māori) people</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>	
<p>TOTAL SCORE</p>	<p>/100</p>

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Appendix 2: Assessment Criteria - Best Long Paper Presentations

PRESENTER:			
SECTION	CRITERIA	SCORE	TOTAL
Abstract	Informative and conforming to Instructions for Authors	/10	/10
Content	Critical review of literature	/10	/50
	Study design and conduct of trial	/10	
	Statistical or analytical methods	/10	
	Relevance to rural / regional critical care	/10	
	Potential to improve the care of Indigenous peoples	/10	
Performance	Delivery of paper	/10	/40
	Timing of paper	/10	
	Clarity and relevance of slides	/10	
	Discussion and questions	/10	
TOTAL SCORE			/100

Appendix 3: Assessment Criteria - Best Lightning Paper Presentations

PRESENTER:			
SECTION	CRITERIA	SCORE	TOTAL
Abstract	Informative and conforming to Instructions for Authors	/10	/10
Content	Methods match aims	/15	/50
	Inferences are supported by data	/15	
	Relevance to the conference: rural / regional critical care but mainly have potential to improve the care of Indigenous peoples	/20	
Performance	Delivery of paper	/15	/40
	Timing of paper	/15	
	Discussion and questions	/10	
TOTAL SCORE			/100