

Reviewer marking criteria

Relevance

- The submission is relevant to this conference.
- Relevance to and recommendations for practice/policy/education/further research clearly identified.

Technical merit

- Clear research aim, objectives/questions.
- Sound, appropriate methodology.
- Study been carried out in a systematic, rigorous manner.
- Analysis has been carried out correctly.
- Data/findings are presented in a coherent format.
- How solid is the presented work? Is the evaluation methodology appropriate? Does the data seem accurate? Are there any fatal flaws in underlying assumptions?

For abstracts relating to clinical research nursing (CRN), please use below technical merit criteria:

- Clear focus / topic, related to clinical research nursing practice.
- Sound justification / explanation of; change in practice / implementation of initiative / approach taken.
- Study / Case study / project beings described has clear aims, methods/ approaches clearly stated and impact / potential impact identified.
- Data/findings/Information are presented in a coherent format.
- How solid is the presented work? Is the evaluation methodology / approach being highlighted appropriate? Does the data or project outcomes seem accurate? Are there any fatal flaws in underlying assumptions or approach taken? Will this be of interest and potentially applicable to the clinical research nursing workforce?

Readability

- Inclusive language is used.

- The writing style is clear (including grammar, spelling, punctuation).
- Submission is well structured.

N.B. if English is not the first language, please take this into consideration and provide appropriate feedback to enable submission if other criteria is met.

Review form on Exordo.

The screenshot shows a 'Preview' screen for a review form. At the top, it says 'Preview' and 'This preview screen shows how the marking scheme will appear to reviewers.' Below this is a section titled 'My Review' with two buttons: 'Don't Review' (red) and 'Edit Review' (green). The main area contains a 'Score' field with a minus sign. Below the score are six rows of criteria, each with a minus sign and a dropdown arrow: 'Relevance', 'Technical Merit', 'Readability', 'Acceptance', 'Author Feedback', and 'Chair Comments'. The 'Author Feedback' and 'Chair Comments' rows show 'No comments provided.' At the bottom, it says 'Review Accepted - Accepted at 11:23am on the 19th of March'.