

CAEP 2019 EDUCATION RESEARCH (QUANTITATIVE) ABSTRACT REVIEWER CRITERIA

| | 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 reviews). |
| SAMPLE SIZE APPROPRIATENESS | Study size not reported, poor survey response rate or no description of databases searched for systematic 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 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 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 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 reviews |
| IMPORTANCE OF TOPIC | Not relevant to EM | Either limited interest or applicable to only a few practitioners of EM | Either important topic or may be practicing-changing for EM | Both an important topic and may be practicing-changing/of interest for EM | Highly innovative, practice-changing for EM |
| 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 |