



Guidelines for submission of poster/presentations to the POGP research competition

The abstract text must be anonymous. i.e. without any authors' or institutions' names. Do not include the name of the hospital, university or city.

All abstract identification details, references, ethical approval, and disclosures will be taken separately as part of the online submission process and will be merged again with the abstract text after review.

Poster/Presentation abstracts review criteria

For poster/presentation abstracts peer reviewers will be asked to assess the soundness of your scholarship and the extent to which your abstract aligns with the field of pelvic health

The following areas will be considered by reviewers when scoring presentation abstracts for oral and poster submissions:

1) Background (importance of the problem or topic)

- Is the problem (or topic area) original/important/relevant to pelvic health?
- Are the aims of the study clearly described?

2) Study Design (design/methods)

- Is the study design appropriate for the stated research question(s) and aims?
- Are the methods/ methodological approach clearly described?

3) Results

- Are the key findings clearly described?
- How confident is the reviewer in the strength/trustworthiness of the findings and/or conclusions/discussion presented?



4) Conclusion / Implications

- Does the conclusion accurately reflect the results/findings?
- How and to what extent are the findings likely to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy?

5) Overall impression

- Was this a well written abstract?
- Was it well presented?
- Will it promote discussion/debate?
- Will this study/idea change anything?



Panel Judging

All submitted abstracts will be reviewed independently by at least two peer reviewers. The aim of this process is to ensure a high-quality programme of posters/presentations and a lively, informative meeting. We welcome interesting, well designed and well conducted work. The main focus of our peer review process is the extent to which submissions meet the criteria for quality, relevance and importance.

Reviewers are asked to mark abstracts using the full range of scores stated for each of the criteria. Each criterion has a score range with 1 being the lowest, and higher scores representing higher quality abstracts (e.g. 1=poor, 5=excellent).

A high scoring abstract will:

- identify an important problem (one which responds to a clear gap in the literature; a practice or policy priority; a topic which is fundamental to primary care)
- describe a clear research question and aim
- set out an appropriate study design which is capable of meeting the stated aims
- offer a clear description of methods and methodological approach
- include findings which are trustworthy

A lower scoring abstract is likely to include poorly focused research that is not highly relevant to pelvic health physiotherapy, or which is poorly designed or executed.