CAEP 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.
APPROPRIATE USE OF QUALITATIVE METHODS AND THEORY (e.g. constructivist grounded theory, phenomenology)	Methods and theory not properly employed/understood, mismatched or inappropriate for the research question, or no discussion of methods and theory.	Vague and nonspecific theoretical approach or methods.	Methods or theoretical approach are suitable, but have limited applicability to the research question. Or, analysis described (e.g. 'coding,' thematic analysis) but no overall methods and theoretical approach.	Methods and theoretical approach are well aligned. Other methods may have been slightly more appropriate for the research question.	Method and theoretical approach are optimally aligned, properly employed/understood, and well-matched to the research question.
POPULATION AND SAMPLING Was the technique used to recruit the study participants appropriate? (The sampling strategy and technique rather than sample size). Did they study the correct population??	Haphazard or unclear rationale for sampling the population, or sampled population inappropriate to understand the research question.	Selected a group of participants that allowed them to answer the question, but left out groups with fundamentally important perspectives on the research question.	Reasonable selection of study participants, but some relevant groups were excluded.	Thoughtful selection of participants, but for practical or logistical reasons could not recruit the best population.	Careful selection of study participants to best understand the research question.
DATA COLLECTION Were the correct data collection techniques selected and applied?	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 Adherence to accepted techniques of the qualitative method employed (e.g. grounded theory employs source triangulation, narrative analysis employing member checking)	Inappropriate techniques or no mention of technique that was used to ensure rigour.	Trivial application of methods to increase the rigour of the analysis.	Uses one technique to ensure rigour in the analysis.	Utilizes two or more techniques for ensuring the rigour in the analysis.	Appropriately uses multiple techniques to establish the rigour of the qualitative analysis.
IMPORTANCE OF THE TOPIC Prioritize topics of major importance to the Canadian emergency community	This research is unlikely to result in important knowledge.	This is a **worthwhile** topic, but small/early.	This is an important topic with potential to improve care.	This is an important topic and reported results matter/can change practice.	This research is **extremely** relevant across the practice of emergency medicine.
CLARITY OF WRITING	Poorly written and hard to understand	Inadequately written or structured	Generally well-written, but requires minor clarifications or corrections	Well-written, but requires a slight correction	Perfect grammar, no errors, very clear expression of ideas