

Guide to scoring Posters

The posters are a mixture of original research, audit, survey and case reports. All should be scored out of 20 in the following way:

- Score 0-10 for **clarity and quality** of poster presentation and response to any questions asked.
- Score 0-10 for **scientific merit** (research) and **quality and impact** (for audit and case reports) using slightly different criteria according to type (see matrix).

To give a total score out of **20**.

The following matrix gives a guide to scoring.

Please use the **full** range of scores ie any number between 0 to 10.

Scoring Matrix for judging all Posters

Score	<u>All categories</u> Clarity and Quality of Poster (0-10)
0	Very poor, confused presentation with important information missing. Untidy. Too much information. Unable to address questions, waffles irrelevance. Poor understanding
3	Some information missing or unclear. Poorly laid out. Response to questions not entirely clear.
7	Comprehensive and clear but some supplementary questions required. Layout could be improved (minor). Addresses most of questions asked.
10	Eye grabbing. Clear, comprehensive, concise, and well organised presentation of all relevant information. Stands alone and does not require additional information Clear concise answers addressing all questions asked. Full understanding of information.

Research Scientific Merit (0-10)	
0	No scientific merit. Very Poor quality research. No hypothesis. Poor methodology and poorly carried out.
3	Fairly poor science. Weak or poorly stated hypothesis, weak methodology, inaccurate data collection and analysis (not always used appropriate tests). Weak or unjustified conclusions.
7	Good science. Hypothesis stated and methodology appropriate. Some inaccuracies but reasonable and some relevant conclusions.
10	Excellent research. Clear important hypothesis. Well conducted with good data presentation and analysis. Strong and relevant conclusions
Case Report Quality and Impact of Case (0-10)	
0	Common, well reported case report. No lessons ie completely nothing new
3	Fairly common and generally known or predictable. No real lessons. Minimal impact on clinical practice
7	Some aspect of case is novel. Adds something to our knowledge and applicable to clinical practice.
10	Unique case. Excellent lessons and relevance to clinical practice
Audit Quality and Impact of Audit (0-10)	
0	Poor audit. No attempt to improve clinical practice
3	Weak audit. Audit loop incomplete or unlikely to be completed. Only of local relevance.
7	Strong audit with evidence of improved practice (or intention to improve). Mainly of local relevance but some important lessons for wider practice. Clear plan for future re audit.
10	Unique. Strong audit with clear plan for improved practice. More than local applicability. Clear re audit after an intervention.
Survey Quality and Impact of Survey (0-10)	
0	Very weak ambiguous or unrepresentative survey. Irrelevant to clinical practice. Poor response rate (<50%).
3	Local relevance only. Some ambiguity/weak questions. Poor significance to clinical practice. Barely adequate response rate (50-60%)
7	Significant results with some wider relevance to national practice. Clear unambiguous questions. Good representation and response rate (>70%)
10	National survey with good representation and response rate(>80%). Highly important to clinical practice.