

Marking Grid for Abstracts of Qualitative and Quantitative Studies*

Score	0	1	2
Title			
Is the work novel?	Similar work conducted in the past	Work conducted in the past but in a different setting or population and/or using different methods	Works appears novel and original
Does the title fully represent the study?	Study focus and design not identified	Study fully represented for both focus and design	
Aims			
Are the aims clearly stated?	Aims not presented or presented but lack clarity	Aims/research questions clearly presented	
Design and Methodology			
Is the design appropriate?	Design not appropriate to aim	Design seems entirely appropriate to the research question	
Is the method clearly described?	Method not described	Method described to an extent but not all relevant details of the CONSORT checklist included or clear (setting, participants and eligibility criteria, selection and approach, intervention, outcomes to match aim)	Method clearly describes all relevant details of the CONSORT checklist (setting, participants and eligibility criteria, selection and approach, intervention, outcomes to match aim)
Results			
Are the results (both positive and negative) clearly described?	No findings are referenced	Findings are referenced but unclear or not fully described according to CONSORT (numbers recruited - randomised if relevant - numbers analysed, outcomes reported)	All results according to CONSORT reported (numbers recruited (randomised if relevant), numbers analysed, outcomes reported) and well-described
Conclusions			
Are the results discussed fully with implications for practice research and/ or policy?	Implications of the research results are unclear or not discussed	Clear implications for practice, research or policy are discussed	Clear implications for practice, research or policy are discussed and limitations noted

*Criteria derived from CONSORT for Abstracts <http://www.consort-statement.org/Media/Default/Downloads/Extensions/CONSORT%20Extension%20for%20Abstracts.pdf>

Total score: /9

	Rationale for outright rejection
	Possible rationale for rejection
	Rationale for acceptance



Marking Grid for Abstracts of Systematic Reviews*

Score	0	1	2
Title			
Is the work novel?	Similar work conducted in the past	Work conducted in the past but in a different setting or population and/or using different methods	Works appears novel and original
Does the title fully represent the study?	Study focus and approach (systematic review/meta-analysis or both) not identified	Study focus and approach (systematic review/meta-analysis or both) identified	
Objectives			
Are the objectives clearly stated?	Objectives not presented or presented but lacking in clarity	Objectives clearly presented in PICO format (participants, interventions, comparators and outcomes)	
Design and Methodology			
Is the method clearly described?	Method not described	Method described to a limited extent. Aspects of method (eligibility criteria, information sources, risk of bias) not entirely.	Method clearly and unequivocally described (eligibility criteria, information sources, risk of bias)
Results			
Are the results (both positive and negative) clearly described?	No findings are referenced	Findings are referenced but unclear or not fully described according to PRISMA	Relevant PRISMA items all reported (number and type of included studies, characteristics of studies and participants, main outcomes). For meta-analyses: also include summary measures, CI and size and direction of effect.
Discussion			
Are the implications of results discussed fully with implications for practice research and / or policy?	Implications of the research results not discussed	Implications are discussed but not clear	Clear implications for practice, research or policy are discussed
Are the strengths and limitations of evidence discussed?	Strengths and limitations of evidence not discussed	Limited discussion of strengths and limitations of evidence	All strengths and limitations of evidence identified (e.g., inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness or risk of bias, other supporting/conflicting evidence)

*Criteria based on PRISMA for Abstracts

<http://www.plosmedicine.org/article/fetchObject.action?uri=info:doi/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001419&representation=PDF>

Total Score: **/10**

	Rationale for outright rejection
	Possible rationale for rejection
	Rationale for acceptance

Disclaimer – The final decision is based on the abstract as a whole. The HSRPP Committee will not enter into discussion on the final decision.

