## **Assessment Criteria**

This paper sets out for potential authors about the assessment criteria being used by reviewers of abstracts for the 1<sup>st</sup> EURIPA Rural Health e-Forum

### **Oral communications and posters**

### Assessment criteria for oral communications and posters

Is it relevant for rural general practice? YES / NO (If NO: The priority is lower)

Each item will be scored: 0 to 5

- 1. Title and keywords
- 2. Introduction: clear and relevant
- 3. Rationale, purpose and research question: clear and well defined
- 4. Subjects and method: appropriate (including criteria of qualitative and quantitative study)
- 5. Results
- 6. Conclusion: answer to the research question

## Reviewers' judgment taking into account both the scoring system and your presenter's preference:

- WS : Accepted as workshop
- OC: Accepted as oral communication
- P: Accepted as poster presentation
- S: «Special Session on abstracts of clinical interest ».
- R: Rejected

#### The process

The anonymized abstracts will be peer reviewed by two reviewers:

- Reviewers will score all abstracts and will summarize their results in website scoring system.
- The Chair of the Scientific Committee gathers the two scores for each paper and will calculate an average score for each abstract
- The Scientific Committee will provide feedback for each rejected abstract
- The Scientific Committee will provide advice and suggestions for those abstracts included in the «Special Session on abstracts of clinical interest ».

### Workshops

# **Assessment criteria for workshops**

Is it relevant for general practice? YES NO (If NO: The priority is lower)

Each item will be quoted: 0 to 5

- 1. Rationale (needs to be served),
- 2. Methods (educational tools and approaches),
- 3. Expected results (skills acquired)
- 4. Impact of workshop (on research, education and health policy).

# Reviewer's judgment taking into account both the scoring system and your presenter's preference

- O: Accepted as oral presentation
- P: Accepted as poster presentation
- S: Special session Interesting paper in progress
- R: Rejected

# The process

- Reviewers will score all abstracts and will summarize their results in website scoring system.
- The Chair of the Scientific Committee gathers the two scores for each paper and will calculate an average score for each abstract
- The Scientific Committee will provide feedback for each rejected abstract

**If in doubt**, you can send your abstract and ask the scientific committee for help by writing an e-mail to ferdinando.petrazzuoli@gmail.com **as soon as possible.**