



## 2018 ASMIRT Conference - Abstract Marking Matrix (Scientific Paper/Systematic Review)

Name of author: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Not acceptable	Below average	Average	Excellent	Outstanding
<b>Relevance of topic to conference theme/s</b>  <b>Max. 3 marks</b>	Research topic is not relevant to any of the conference themes (Care, Communicate, Collaborate) and is not relevant to the attending audience. Title does not reflect abstract content.	Difficult to determine relevance of research topic to the conference themes (Care, Communicate, Collaborate) and relevance to the attending audience. Title partly reflects abstract content.	Research topic is relevant to one or more of the conference themes (Care, Communicate, Collaborate) and will be of interest to a small number of audience members. Title reflects abstract content.	Research topic is relevant to one or more of the conference themes (Care, Communicate, Collaborate) and will be of great interest to audience members. Title reflects abstract content.	Research topic is highly relevant to one or more of the conference themes (Care, Communicate, Collaborate) and will be of great interest to a wide audience. Title reflects abstract content
	(0)	(1)	(1.5)	(2)	(3)
<b>Background (objectives), Aims and Research Methodology</b>  <b>Max. 4 marks</b>	No discussion of research aims or methodology. No referenced literature to support the study objectives	Basic discussion of research aims. Ethics approval has not been discussed (if applicable). Research methodology used is unclear and unable to determine if appropriate for the research aims. Literature referred to is not current (within last 10 years) and no reference list provided at the end of the abstract.	Good description of the research aims. Ethics approval has been obtained and stated (if applicable). Good description of the research methodology used, but not appropriate for the study aims. Referenced literature is current (within last 10 years), but does not adequately support the study objectives. Reference list is provided	Excellent description of the research aims. Ethics approval has been obtained and stated (if applicable). Excellent description of the research methodology used. Research methodology is appropriate for the study aims. Referenced literature adequately supports the study objectives. Current literature (within last 10 years) has been referred to with a reference list provided at the end of the abstract.	Research aims are clearly defined. Ethics approval has been obtained and stated (if applicable). Outstanding and in-depth description of the research methodology used, which matches the aims of the study. Referenced literature outstandingly supports the study objectives. Current literature (within last 10 years) has been referred to with a reference list provided at the end of the abstract.
	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)



**ASMIRT 2018**  
**CANBERRA 15-18 MARCH**  
 care | communicate | collaborate



**(Scientific Paper/Systematic Review)**

<p><b>Results, Discussion /Conclusion</b></p> <p>Max. 6 marks</p>	<p>Research results are unclear, conclusion does not support results.</p> <p>(0)</p>	<p>Results not discussed, with no acknowledgment if these are pending. Conclusion does not reflect aim and reported results.</p> <p>(1.5)</p>	<p>Results are discussed at a basic level. Conclusion is acceptable based on aims and reported results.</p> <p>(3)</p>	<p>Results are discussed. Excellent conclusion which reflects aims and reported results.</p> <p>(4.5)</p>	<p>Clear and concise results. Outstanding conclusion reflecting aims and reported results.</p> <p>(6)</p>
<p><b>Clarity of Abstract</b></p> <p>Max. 4 marks</p>	<p>The research process has not been described and it is unclear what the research project involved. The reviewer is unable to read and follow the abstract submission. Abstract contains personal feelings on research subject. Numerous spelling and grammatical errors exist.</p> <p>(0)</p>	<p>Basic description of the research process and what the research involved. Abstract contains some bias. It is difficult to follow what the author is saying. Some spelling and grammatical errors exist.</p> <p>(1)</p>	<p>Good description of the research process and what the research involved. Abstract is clear. Some spelling and grammatical errors exist.</p> <p>(2)</p>	<p>Excellent description of the research process and what the research involved. Abstract is clear and free of bias with no spelling or grammatical errors.</p> <p>(3)</p>	<p>Outstanding description of the research process and what the research involved. Abstract is free of bias and is based on facts. Abstract is clear and easy to follow with no spelling or grammatical errors.</p> <p>(4)</p>
<p><b>Novelty of Abstract</b></p> <p>Max. 3 marks</p>	<p>The abstract details an out of date technique or information which is not new and has already been thoroughly presented.</p> <p>(0)</p>	<p>It is difficult to determine if the topic presented provides new or original information.</p> <p>(1)</p>	<p>The topic presented is current. It provides new, original information or presents a novel technique which will be of interest to a small number of audience members</p> <p>(1.5)</p>	<p>The topic presented is current. It provides new, original information or presents a novel technique which will be of interest to audience members</p> <p>(2)</p>	<p>The topic presented is current. It provides new, original information or presents a novel technique which will be of great interest to the audience</p> <p>(3)</p>