



14-16 June 2017

23rd Annual Meeting of

THE SOCIETY IN EUROPE

FOR THE SIMULATION APPLIED TO MEDICINE

Enlightening medical education for 23 years

Guidelines to SESAM 2017 Abstract Review

Brief outline

Prepared by SESAM 2014 Scientific Committee

Updated by SESAM 2016/17 Scientific Committee



Overview

This document is intended to provide information, guidance and support to members of the SESAM 2017 Abstract Review Committee.

The presentation will review the rationale, process and outcomes of the abstract review process.

Introduction

The objectives of these guidelines are:

- To improve consistency of ratings among reviewers.
- To suggest factors for consideration when rating abstracts.
- To suggest an approach to the review process.
- To provide examples of helpful comments.
- To enhance the experience for the reviewer.

Outcomes of review process

1. A scientific program that:
 - Is of high quality and excites conference attendees
 - Reflects innovation and diversity of healthcare simulation
 - Addresses education, faculty development, debriefing, technology, or patient safety
2. Provides constructive and supportive feedback to abstract authors

Overview of abstract review process

1. Submitted abstract are anonymously distributed to two volunteer reviewers (depending on their area of expertise).
2. Reviewers use the SESAM Online Abstract Review System to provide an overall score and comment. The maximum score is 45 points.

3. Based on the average rating of the two reviewers, abstracts will be assigned:
 - *Accepted as oral presentation*, if Score >30 points
 - *Accepted as poster presentation*, if the score is between 18 points and 30 points
 - *Not accepted – invite to review*, if Score < 18 points
4. Authors will be informed of the decision.
5. Abstract presentations will be assigned to a time slot in the program.
6. All steps of the process will be verified and accompanied by SESAM Scientific Committee.

Rating the Abstract

Does it fit one of the 2017 conference topics?

- Patient Safety/Quality Improvement
- Assessment Using Simulation
- Curriculum Development
- Faculty Development
- Debriefing
- Inter professional/Team Education
- New Technologies and Innovation
- Centre Administration and Program Evaluation
- Technical Operations
- Other

Type of abstract

A novelty this year is the classification of scientific abstracts into two categories: Descriptive Studies and Research Studies, each being organized and rated differently.

1. For Descriptive Studies: the abstract is organized into three sections: Introduction & Aims, Description and Discussion.
2. For Research Studies: the abstract is organized into three sections: Introduction & Aims, Methods and Results and Discussion.

All abstracts will be rated in three dimensions: quality of the content, quality of writing, and educational value, through specific questions. Each question will be rated

with the following scale: 0-Absent | 1-Insufficient | 2-Reasonable | 3-Good | 4-Very good | 5-Excellent

Quality of the Content

The quality of content should assess:

1. For descriptive studies:
 - **Introduction & Aims:** provided context for the descriptive study; clearly stated hypothesis
 - **Description:** concisely described the methodology/educational program
 - **Discussion:** discussed the interest and impact of the proposed study; argued the novelty of the methodology/educational program

2. For research studies:
 - **Introduction & Aims:** provided context for the research study; clearly stated hypothesis
 - **Methods:** concisely described the study design
 - **Results & Discussion:** presented the results clearly, supporting the study hypothesis; argued, based on data (not speculation), the impact and novelty of the research

Quality of writing

The quality of writing should assess:

Informative title and structured as recommended, with correct spelling/grammar and coherent writing

Educational Value

The educational value should assess:

- Important contribution to research/theory or knowledge
- Novel or innovative topic or approach
- Relevant to conference aims and for conference delegates

SESAM Online Abstract Review Form

Quality of the Content

1.1 Introduction/Rationale - Provide context and general aim

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

1.2 Aim and Objectives - Clearly stated hypothesis

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

1.3 Methods - Concisely described study design

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

1.4 Results - The results are clearly stated/presented and support hypothesis

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

1.5 Discussion - Based on data not speculation

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

Quality of writing

2.1 Informative title and structured as recommended, with correct spelling/grammar and coherent writing

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

Educational Value

3.1 Important contribution to research/theory or knowledge

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

3.2 Novel or innovative contribution

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

3.3 Relevant to conference aims and for conference delegates

0 - Absent 1 - Insufficient 2 - Reasonable 3 - Good 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent

Comments

Have you finished reviewing? Check this box.

Save

Considerations for Reviewer Comments

- Consider the tone of the comments – are they constructive and helpful? Do they suggest a better approach?
- Remember that the selection of the presentation format (oral/poster) will be based on the score. If you consider the abstract is not attractive enough for an oral presentation then the score should reflect that (<30 points).
- Low scores should be supported by specific comments. If an abstract scores below 18 points, please provide specific comments/suggestions so the author can learn how to improve.

Reviewing Dilemmas

Well written but poor content

- Try to address the potential significance of this work: Has little work been done or reported on in this area? Is this an emerging area of practice?
- Check yourself for reviewer bias – is this a content/practice area that you are familiar with?
- Ensure that the educational value section marks reflect your comments and perspective.

Unfamiliar methodology or terminology

- Highlight unfamiliar terms or methods in the first review and look them up.
- Focus more on substantial methodological issues rather than details, as these are difficult to assess in a 400-word abstract.
- Balance judging scientific merit with the author's ability to convey their results and interpretation.
- If you feel unqualified to review a particular abstract, please contact csacouto@med.up.pt or stefan@gisin.net

What if I am unsure how to grade an abstract?

- For any questions or concerns please contact: csacouto@med.up.pt or stefan@gisin.net

Thank you for your contribution. Your collaboration is much appreciated!