

SCTS ABSTRACT ASSESSMENT 2006

This year we will be accepting abstracts for two types of session; scientific and forum. Scientific sessions will contain abstracts that report an original scientific contribution relevant to a cardiothoracic surgical meeting. Forum sessions will contain abstracts that present clinical data that broadens understanding about a condition or procedure. The programme committee will retain the right to move abstracts between the two types of session.

Scientific papers will be presented as oral (7 minutes presentation and 3 minutes discussion) or interactive (3 minutes presentation and 7 minutes discussion) papers. Forum papers will have 5 minutes presentation and 5 minutes discussion, if appropriate presenters will be encouraged to use video.

Use the following guidelines to decide whether to submit your work as a scientific abstract or a forum abstract.

Scientific sessions will contain abstracts that tend to:

- Be laboratory based or clinical
- Have a null hypothesis
- Compare two or more forms of intervention
- Use comparative statistics, give p values

Forum sessions will contain abstracts that tend to:

- Be clinical
- Report a case series
- Report a new procedure or technique
- Use descriptive statistics, not have p values

When you have decided to submit your abstract as a scientific or forum abstract you must choose a category. There are five categories:

- Adult cardiac
- Thoracic
- Transplantation
- Congenital
- Experimental and miscellaneous

Select the category that is most appropriate for your work. If the principle outcome measure is clinical then put it in the appropriate clinical category. If the work is laboratory based or has an outcome measure not in routine clinical practice submit it in the experimental and miscellaneous category.

Abstracts will be assessed against the criteria below:

Abstract Assessment Matrix

Criteria	0	1	2	3	4	
Impact						
Originality						
Design/Data analysis						
Conclusions						
			TOTAL			

Scientific Abstract Marking Criteria

- **Impact.** Score 1,2, 3 or 4. This reflects the relevance of the abstract to a clinical cardiothoracic surgical meeting. Work should have direct clinical relevance to score 3 or 4.
- **Originality.** Score 0,1 or 2. Score 0 if the study repeats previous work, 1 if it extends previous work and 2 if it is completely original.
- **Design / Data Analysis.** Score 1,2 or 3. In general a case control series would score 1 and a randomised trial 2. For laboratory work controlled experiments score 1 or 2. If the data analysis is clear, uses appropriate statistics and allows for confounding variables add 1.
- **Conclusion.** Score 1 if the conclusions are clearly stated and supported by the results. Score 0 if this is not the case.

Forum Abstract Marking Criteria

- **Impact.** Score 1,2,3 or 4. In general a series simply reporting an established operation or condition for which the natural history is well known would score 1. A rare condition or operation would score 2. A new procedure would score 3. Add 1 if the work is important.
- **Originality.** Score 0,1 or 2. Score 0 if the study repeats previous work, 1 if it extends previous work and 2 if it is completely original.
- **Analysis.** Score 1,2 or 3. Score 1 if there is important data missing and 3 if there is enough data to put it in context. This would normally include details about the population from which the series was drawn, closing interval and completeness of follow-up.
- **Conclusion.** Score 1 if the conclusions are clearly stated and supported by the results. Score 0 if this is not the case.