CAEP EDUCATION RESEARCH (QUALITATIVE) ABSTRACT REVIEWER CRITERIA

	1 – Unacceptable	2 – Poor	3 – Good	4 – Very Good	5 - Excellent
CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES OR QUESTION	No identifiable objectives or research question.	Objectives and research question are not stated clearly.	Objectives and research question could be improved.	Adequate study objectives and research question.	Well thought-out study objectives and research question.
APPROPRIATENESS AND COHERENCE OF QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH Is there coherence among the research question, paradigm/epistemology (where stated), methodology (e.g., phenomenology, constructivist grounded theory, ethnography, case study, narrative inquiry), and methods (e.g., interviews, focus groups, observation, document analysis)?	The qualitative approach is absent, inappropriate, or fundamentally inconsistent with the research question. Methods are insufficiently described to determine the qualitative approach, or there are major inconsistencies between the stated methodology/theoretical framework and the study design.	A qualitative approach is identified or implied, but is vague or inadequately described. There is limited evidence of alignment between the research question, methodological approach, theoretical/conceptual framework (if applicable), and study design.	The qualitative approach is generally appropriate for the research question, but methodological coherence is only partially demonstrated. Methods of analysis may be described (e.g., coding or thematic analysis) without sufficient explanation of the broader methodological approach or rationale. Any theoretical/conceptual framework used has limited integration with the study design.	The qualitative approach is clearly described, appropriate for the research question, and coherently aligned with the study design. The authors demonstrate appropriate understanding and application of their methodology. Where a theoretical/conceptual framework is used, it is meaningfully integrated. For mixed-methods studies, the rationale for methodological mixing and approach to integration are clear.	The qualitative methodological approach is clearly articulated, appropriately applied, and highly coherent with the research question, data collection, and analytic approach. Where a theoretical or conceptual framework is used, its role is clear and appropriate. For mixed-methods studies, the rationale for mixing methods and the integration strategy are particularly well articulated and coherent.
POPULATION AND SAMPLING Is the population appropriate for addressing the research question? Is the sampling strategy appropriate and adequately described (e.g., purposive, theoretical, maximum variation, criterion sampling)? Consider the rationale and strategy for sampling rather than sample size alone.	Haphazard or unclear rationale for sampling, or the sampled population is inappropriate to understand the research question.	Sampling strategy is poorly described or justified, or groups with fundamentally important perspectives on the research question were left out.	Reasonable sampling strategy and population, but the rationale is only partially described or some relevant perspectives were not included.	Purposeful sampling strategy is clearly justified and aligned with the research question, with only minor limitations (e.g., practical or logistical constraints on recruitment).	The population and sampling strategy are clearly justified and purposefully selected to generate information-rich data relevant to the research question. Important perspectives are appropriately considered, and any sampling limitations are acknowledged.
DATA COLLECTION Are the data sources and methods of data collection appropriate for the research question and qualitative approach? Are they sufficiently described to assess their appropriateness?	Data collection is inappropriate and likely led to an unacceptably biased or incomplete dataset.	Data collection is mismatched with the type of question and/or sampling.	Data collection is sufficiently matched to the type of question or sampling, though other methods may have been better suited. (e.g. focus groups were used when individual interviews would have been better).	Data collection is reasonable, but limited by 1-2 key elements (e.g. budget restrictions, logistics of the study design).	Data collection is well-matched to the type of question and sampling, yielding the optimal type of data (e.g. for sensitive topics, individual interviews were used to collect data to ensure honesty and participant safety).
ANALYTIC APPROACH Is the analytic approach (e.g., thematic analysis, content analysis, grounded theory coding, narrative analysis) appropriate for the methodology and research question, and sufficiently described? Is the analysis systematic, with strategies to enhance	Analytic approach is absent, inappropriate, or fundamentally inconsistent with the stated methodology or research question.	Analytic approach is insufficiently described or demonstrates limited methodological coherence; strategies to support trustworthiness are unclear or inappropriate.	Analytic approach is generally appropriate and sufficiently described to understand how findings were developed, with some attention to trustworthiness.	Analytic approach is clearly described and well aligned with the methodology and research question. Appropriate strategies (including reflexivity, where relevant) are used to enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the analysis.	Analytic approach is methodologically coherent, transparent, and appropriately rigorous. Strategies to enhance trustworthiness and reflexivity are thoughtfully selected and clearly integrated with the methodological approach.

trustworthiness (e.g., credibility, dependability, confirmability, transferability) and reflexivity that fit the methodology? Judge the fit of these strategies, not the number used.					
IMPORTANCE OF THE TOPIC Does the study address an important issue for emergency medicine? Give particular consideration to its relevance and potential contribution to the Canadian emergency medicine community.	This topic is only of interest to a small group of emergency physicians and is unlikely to result in important knowledge.	This is an important topic, will be of interest to *some* emergency physicians, including those who do not study this topic.	This is an important topic, will be of interest to *many* emergency physicians, including those who do not study this topic.	This is an important topic, will be of interest to *most* emergency physicians, including those who do not study this topic.	This topic and/or question is important and relevant to every emergency provider.
CLARITY OF WRITING OR WRITING OF PRESENTATION	Poorly written throughout (e.g. poor syntax, grammar, phrasing), incoherent, and/or inconsistent with the CAEP submission guidelines.	Poorly written in some areas (e.g. incomplete ideas, >1-2 grammatical errors, vague in some areas). Adheres somewhat to the CAEP submission guidelines.	Adequately written, could be improved in some areas (e.g. incomplete ideas, 1-2 grammatical errors, vague in some areas). Adheres mostly to the CAEP submission guidelines.	Coherent and well-written, only minor errors. Adheres to the CAEP submission guidelines	Perfect grammar, no errors, very clear expression of ideas. Adheres to the CAEP submission guidelines.