

## BTS Abstract Prizes scoring criteria

Submission guidance for authors: demonstrate one or more of the following

- Use of QI methodology to support an evidence-based change in patient care.
- Models of education that have delivered training in your service to encourage best practice.
- Innovative integrated care solutions where you are working collaboratively across traditional NHS boundaries.
- Innovative use of digital technology.

The abstract is well written, easy to follow and is accessible to a wide audience.

- *We are looking for the abstract to have a clear format and layout, allowing the reader to understand the aims, objectives and outcomes of the project.*

The abstract has a clear focus on improving patient centred outcomes.

- *Please include clear details about how patient outcomes were considered – these do not need to be large scale changes to treatment, small-scale projects that improve a patient's experience or engagement are equally relevant.*

The abstract describes work that has involved a multi-professional approach, which may also include patient, carer and public voice.

- *We are keen to support work that takes a multi-professional, integrated approach to patient care.*

The abstract describes clearly work that has been tested/proven using recognised methodology (QI, audit, educational).

- Are the results clearly presented, are the data reported and summarised appropriately?

The abstract identifies processes that are of value and would be of immediate benefit to respiratory teams

- Can the results of the work be implemented, or replicated quickly and easily?

## Clinical Grand Round scoring criteria

Case submission guidance for authors:

- Ideal submissions will highlight a case demonstrating aspects of commonly encountered diseases that provide the audience with key learning points, whilst providing a diagnostic or management challenge.
- The judging panel are not looking for cases that focus on esoteric or rare diseases.
- The abstract should include an introduction, description of the case and conclusion with learning points.
- Judging at the shortlisting stage will be based on interest level/learning points and content/style/well written.

**Score 5** If the abstract demonstrates to a high level, aspects of a commonly encountered disease, provides a diagnostic or management challenge and includes key learning points that are useful and relevant for practice. The case will be of great interest to a multi-professional audience.

**Score 4** If the abstract demonstrates aspects of commonly encountered diseases, provides a diagnostic or management challenge, and includes key learning points that will be of some relevance for practice. The case will be of some interest to the audience, but may be most applicable to one audience in particular.

**Score 3** If the abstract demonstrates aspects of commonly encountered diseases but does not provide a diagnostic or management challenge or has not identified the appropriate key learning points. The case will be of some interest to the audience.

**Score 2** If the abstract covers aspects of commonly encountered diseases but does not include key learning points and as written will be of little interest or value to the audience.

**Score 1** If the abstract describes a case that focuses on esoteric or rare diseases.

**Score 0.5** The abstract is not well written (does not provide an introduction, description of the case or conclusion with learning points) or is not suitable for a Clinical Grand Round