

2020 REVIEWER GUIDELINES

Peer review process

All submitted abstracts will be reviewed independently by at least two peer reviewers. The review process aims to ensure that submissions meet the criteria for quality, relevance and importance. This is put in place to select the highest quality submissions for the conference program. We welcome interesting, well designed and well conducted work.

Reviewers will be 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).

Oral and Poster presentations

Peer reviewers will be asked to assess abstracts according to a set list of criteria. The following areas will be considered by reviewers when scoring abstracts:

1) Importance of the topic

- Is the topic original/important/relevant to primary care?
- Are the aims of the study clearly described?

2) Design and methods

- Is the study design appropriate for the research aim(s)/objective(s), hypothesis(es) and question(s)?
- Are the methods clearly described?
- What is the overall quality of the study methods (utilised or proposed)?

3) Findings

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

For work in progress reviewers will be asked to assess the quality of the conclusions/discussion taking into account interim findings/conclusions.

4) Implications

- How important are the research findings?
- How, and to what extent, are the findings likely to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy?

For work in progress reviewers will be asked to consider the potential of the project to influence clinical or research practice, education or policy.

“Dangerous Ideas” presentations

Peer reviewers will be asked to assess abstracts according to a set list of criteria. The following areas will be considered by reviewers when scoring abstracts:

1) Is the idea novel?

- Is it original/important/relevant to primary care?

2) Does the idea offer a challenge?

- Does the idea shift paradigms? Challenge dogma? Encourage us to think outside the box?

3) Could the idea make a difference?

- How could the idea change clinical or research practice, education or policy?

Interactive Workshops - Building Research Skills

Peer reviewers will be asked to assess abstracts according to a set list of criteria. The following areas will be considered by reviewers when scoring abstracts:

1) Relevance of topic

- Is the workshop topic important, interesting and relevant to primary care researchers?

2) Objectives

- Are the learning objectives of the workshop clear, relevant and achievable?

3) Format

- Is the proposed format of the workshop likely to provoke discussion and interaction between workshop participants?