NAEMSP Abstract Scoring Rubric

1. Clarity of Research Question/Objectives

- **1**: No research question or objective stated.
- **2**: Research question and objective are stated, but vague or unclear.
- **3**: Research question and objective are well-defined and clear.

2. Study Design & Methodological Rigor

Use general criteria if specific study design is not listed.

	General Criteria	**Clinical trial/ experimental**	**Observational study (prospective)**	**Observational study (retrospective or secondary analysis)**	**Qualitative**	**Systematic review/ meta-analysis**
1	Vague or unclear description; inappropriate study design or theoretical approach for research question; serious flaws that would affect findings	Not randomized, not blinded, sample size too small to draw conclusions; major risk of bias	Unclear methods; vulnerable to bias (including selection bias) or confounding; poor data collection methods	Unclear methods; vulnerable to bias (including selection bias, missing data, misclassification) or confounding; dataset not appropriate for research question	Analytic and theoretical framework, coding, and/or data collection and guides are not specified or poorly described; haphazard or unclear sampling	Unclear search or selection criteria; inappropriate pooling of data (including meta-analysis when not appropriate)
2	Study design or theoretical approach address the research question but with moderate flaws that may affect findings	Randomized for main outcome; vulnerable to bias or poor blinding	Bias and confounding controlled but with shortcomings; data collection reasonable with some flaws	Bias and confounding controlled but with shortcomings; dataset reasonable for research question but with some flaws	Analytic and theoretical framework, coding, and/or data collection and guides are reasonable but with some flaws; thoughtful selection of participants	Adequate search strategy and selection criteria; mostly follows PRISMA methodology; addresses heterogeneity in approach with some flaws
3	Study design or theoretical approach are well-suited and rigorously applied to the research question with no to minor flaws that may affect findings	Appropriately randomized, blinded, controlled, and powered	Excellent control of bias and confounding; well-designed and applied data collection methods	Excellent control of bias and confounding; dataset is well-suited for research question	Analytic and theoretical framework, coding, and/or data collection and guides are clearly articulated and well-suited for research question; careful selection of participants	Exhaustive search, well described selection criteria; follows PRIMSA methodology; addresses heterogeneity well in approach

3. Data Analysis
Use general criteria if unsure whether study was quantitative or qualitative or if study used mixed methods.

	General Criteria	Quantitative	Qualitative
1	No data analysis described or completely inappropriate and flawed analysis	No data analysis described; outcome measures not stated; severely flawed or suboptimal statistical methods	No description of techniques or approach; trivial application of analytic or theoretical framework
2	Data analysis is described but either unclear or moderately flawed	Analytic methods are unclear or not comprehensive; outcomes measures described but unclear; statistical approach is mostly adequate but better approaches were possible	Unclear description of techniques, approach, or framework; applies framework in a reasonable way with some flaws
3	Clear and appropriate data analysis, aligned with the research question	Analytic methods clearly described; outcomes measures clearly defined; statistical methods were comprehensive and appropriate for research question	Clearly described; appropriately uses multiple techniques that align with research question; applies framework well

4. Results
- **1**: No results presented (including "forthcoming" results), incomplete, or hard to follow.
- **2**: Results are fairly complete but lack some detail; could be clearer to follow.
- **3**: Results are complete, well-presented, and easy to follow.

5. Strength of Conclusions
- **1**: No clear conclusions or conclusions unrelated to results.
- **2**: Conclusions are drawn but have inconsistencies with results; may overstate findings; do not fully capture limitations and implications.
- **3**: Conclusions are well-supported by the results, clearly articulated, and appropriately reflect study limitations.

6. Importance and Relevance to the Field
- **0**: Topic is irrelevant or of little interest to EMS.
- **1**: Topic is moderately relevant to some of the EMS community but not highly impactful.
- **2**: Topic is relevant to EMS and of interest to many EMS systems.
- **4**: Highly relevant topic to EMS and has potential to change practice.

7. Innovation
- **0**: Not innovative or novel; re-examination of already proven knowledge; question has been asked and answered.
- **1**: Traditional approach but applied in a different manner.
- **2**: Moderately innovative with some new ideas or approaches.
- **4**: Highly innovative with novel ideas, approaches, or findings.

8. Quality of Writing & Publication Readiness
- **0**: Poorly written, unclear, and difficult to follow.
- **1**: Generally clear but needs improvement in clarity or structure.
- **2**: Well-written, clear, and logically organized.