CAEP QIPS ABSTRACT REVIEWER CRITERIA

	1 – Unacceptable	2 – Poor	3 – Good	4 – Very good	5 – Excellent
Problem characterization	No quality, safety and/or resource stewardship gap/problem being addressed	Background information is minimal and vague	Adequate information provided, but not specific	Complete and well-described gap/problem relevant to emergency medicine	Presents epidemiological and/or local data describing the burden of the problem
Aim statement	No aim statement or objective/ hypothesis provided	Vague and/or inappropriate aim statement (e.g., scope unrealistic)	Good aim/objective statement, but lacks one/some components of a '4'	Answers the question, "What, by when, and by how much?"	SMART aim statement: Specific, Measurable, Actionable, Realistic, Time-defined
Measures	No measures/ outcomes tracked	Measures/outcomes are stated but inappropriate or unreliable	Measure is well-defined and relevant, but there is only one	Includes outcome (patient-oriented), process (fidelity of intervention, surrogate outcomes) and/or balancing measures (unintended consequences)	Clearly defined and relevant family of (i.e. multiple) measures tracked
Change theory and idea(s); implementation	No intervention tested or implemented	A single intervention tested, but not clearly linked to the problem being addressed (not in causal pathway)	Only one well-done intervention linked to the problem being addressed	Multiple interventions, but without evidence of refinement or reflection between them, or unlikely sustainable	Deliberate use of QI methodology (e.g., PDSA / Plan-Do-Study-Act cycles, driver diagram) to drive improvement, with many interventions clearly linked to problem
Evaluation/results	No evaluation of the intervention provided	Evaluation was performed, but inappropriate or erroneous	Data are presented clearly and appropriately, as a before-and-after evaluation	Data are presented clearly, with attempt to link intervention(s) to changes seen	Deliberate and effective use of QI methods (e.g., repeated sampling, run charts, SPC charts)
Discussion & impact	No discussion of the results	Vague and incomplete discussion of the impact locally or possible learning for others EDs	Discussion of impact with some lessons learned, but superficial or not actionable	Lessons learned are relevant locally and useful to other EDs, but no mention of sustainability or scalability	Project has all of: useful results (can be negative), key lessons learned, potential for impact in system, likely sustainable locally, and scalable to other EDs
Overall impression	Definitely should be rejected by CAEP	Probably should be rejected by CAEP	Should be offered a poster presentation; writing quality is adequate	Could be offered a *moderated* poster presentation; well-written	Should be offered an *oral* presentation (specific logistics variable each year)
Additional comments	Are there particular concerns or strengths about this abstract that should be flagged?				