CAEP RESEARCH (QUANTITATIVE) ABSTRACT REVIEWER CRITERIA

CAEP | ACMU

	1 – Unacceptable	2 – Poor	3 – Good	4 – Very Good	5 - Excellent
CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES	No clear objectives or very inappropriate	Stated objectives are poor	Adequate study objectives but not optimally detailed	Objectives are clear, but require minor clarification	Appropriate, complete and well-described objectives
CHOICE OF APPROACH	Design did not assess stated hypothesis/objectives or design used is not clear	Chosen study design was sub-optimal to assess the stated objectives	Chosen study design was reasonable to assess the stated objectives	Chosen study design was a very good method for assessing the stated objectives	Chosen study design was best method for testing the stated objectives
OUTCOME MEASURES and ASSESSMENT OF BIAS	Outcome measure not stated or high likelihood of significant bias	Outcome measure stated, but not defined or sub-optimal protection against bias/ cannot assess risks for bias	Outcome measures stated, but not ideal or with some mild potential for bias	Defined outcomes measures, but incompletely controlled, or protected from bias	Clearly defined outcome measures, and well-protected from bias
STATISTICS	Severely flawed or no statistical methods were reported	Statistical methods and conclusions are suboptimal or incomplete	Statistical methods and reporting are mostly adequate, but not comprehensive	Statistical methods and reporting are largely correct, but are missing few descriptors	Statistical methods and reporting are comprehensive and correct (i.e., p- values/CI/Kappa/ Categorizations for qualitative or systematic/scoping reviews)
SAMPLE SIZE APPROPRIATENESS	Study size not reported, poor survey response rate or no description of databases searched for systematic/scoping reviews	Examples: (a) inadequate powered RCT or prospective cohort study or retrospective studies; (b) small or low - response-rate surveys; (c) inadequate number of databases covered for systematic/scoping reviews	Examples: (a) feasibility or single-centre RCT or prospective cohort study or retrospective studies; (b) large, suitable-response-rate surveys; (c) adequate number of databases covered for systematic/scoping reviews	Examples: (a) well-powered single-centre RCT or prospective cohort study or retrospective studies; (b) large, national, high-response-rate surveys; (c) most appropriate databases covered for systematic/scoping reviews	Examples: (a) well-powered multicentre RCT or prospective cohort study or retrospective studies; (b) large, international, high-response-rate surveys; (c) all relevant databases covered for systematic/scoping reviews
IMPORTANCE OF TOPIC	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.
WRITING QUALITY	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
OVERALL IMPRESSION	Unacceptable	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent