



# Research Symposium

**BDA EVENTS** ➤ **GET INSPIRED**

## Guidance for peer review of abstracts

Reviewers are essential to the success of the BDA Research Symposium and we aim to optimise the process for you. The guidance for reviewing abstracts has been updated with the aim of simplifying the process and improving the consistency of reviewing across streams.

Before reviewers receive the abstracts for review, they will have been checked to ensure they adhere to the following;

- Presentation guidelines, for example does not exceed 450 words and references are in Vancouver style.
- Study type, e.g. no narrative reviews or protocols
- Contain a study aim, methods, a statement referring to approval to undertake the project (ethics if relevant) and some results.

## Outcome and feedback

We aim to accept as many abstracts as possible; the symposium continues to be supportive of professionals new to research and we offer the opportunity for authors to respond to feedback to improve the quality of their abstract.

The outcome from your review will be one of the following options:

**ACCEPT** with/ without recommendations – reviewers can make up to 3 recommendations, which will be optional for the authors to respond to within a specific time frame. The abstract will NOT be reviewed again.

**ACCEPT IF** up to 3 conditions are addressed within a specified time frame. The revised abstract will be reviewed.

**REJECT** with reason outlined.

Abstracts submitted for a stream award will also be scored (see below). We expect the vast majority of authors to enter for an award, however, for those who 'opt out' the scoring process does not need to be followed. In these cases, please provide an outcome from the three options above and, where relevant, recommendations/ conditions.

If you have any questions about the reviewer guidance please email [research@bda.uk.com](mailto:research@bda.uk.com)

**Guidance for SCORING abstracts for BDA Research Symposium Stream awards – only used for the initial abstract submission.**

Please score each section, the score will be used to judge the stream winner but will not be passed onto the author. In recognition of the broad range of research activities and methods within abstract submissions, the guidance for scoring cannot be more specific. For guidance, an abstract scoring 0 or 1 for any section would be expected to have at least one condition (with/ without additional recommendations) relating to that section; an abstract scoring 2 may have recommendations but not conditions related to that section and an abstract scoring 3 would have no recommendations or conditions for that section.

	0	1	2	3	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
Background clearly described with justification for the work.	Background is not relevant to the study	The issue is poorly described	The issue is described well	The issue is described concisely and efficiently		
Study aim makes the purpose clear.	Purpose cannot be understood	Study purpose poorly explained	Adequate presentation of study aim(s)	Excellent, clearly presented study aim(s)		
Do the methods/ analysis/approach (as described) enable the aim to be addressed? E.g. Appropriate statistical tests described/ consideration been given to a theoretical framework.	Inadequate description of methods/ approach and/ or inappropriate methods used	Limited explanation of method/ approach and/ or methods appear suboptimal to address aim	Methods/ approach is described adequately and are appropriate to address aim.	Methods/ approach clearly described and replicable. Focused on relevance to aim and the results presented		
Statement of ethical approve/ permission	Inadequate/ missing	Some clarity required	Adequately detailed	Good, clear statement, no missing information		
Results presented clearly, relevant to study aim and interpreted accurately.	Unable to understand the data/ findings presented, substantial missing data relative to methods	Data/ findings presented but lack some key details	Adequate presentation of data/ findings	Excellent presentation of data/ findings		
Conclusion consistent with the findings	Conclusion missing or does not relate to findings	Conclusion OK but limited	Good interpretation of findings and conclusion	Excellent interpretation of findings and conclusion		
Overall presentation of the abstract, use of person-centred language, formatted according to guidelines	Many errors	Adequate presentation	Good presentation	Excellent presentation		
What is the potential impact and interest to the dietetic workforce/ nutrition	Limited potential impact, somewhat interesting	Local impact, interesting and valuable to some in the profession/ locality	National impact, interesting and valuable to many	International impact, with broad reach and benefit. Extremely interesting and important to a wide range of individuals		
				<b>TOTAL SCORE (max 24)</b>		

**Outcome and feedback for all abstracts:** We aim to accept as many abstracts as possible; the symposium is supportive of professionals new to research.

Comments to the author should be supportive and designed to help the author improve the abstract. Please bear in mind that there is a strict word limit, so it may be difficult for the author to address some issues/ provide a lot of detail. Consider whether changes that will add substantially to the length of the abstract could be posed as recommendations for the presentation rather than changes to the abstract itself.

	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	If reviewer 1 & 2 do not agree – please refer to the lead reviewer (for supported streams) or back to the BDA office
<b>ACCEPT</b> without recommendations			
<b>ACCEPT</b> with recommendations			
<b>ACCEPT IF</b> up to 3 conditions addressed within specified time frame.			
<b>REJECT</b> with reason outlined.			

If required, the following will be shared with the author. Please note, these should be either from the lead reviewer or agreed between reviewers.

	<b>The following conditions must be addressed for the abstract to be considered</b>
1	
2	
3	

	<b>The following recommendations are optional</b>
1	
2	
3	

	<b>The abstract was rejected for the following reason(s) *</b>
1	
2	

\* Rejections are only likely after authors have had the chance to respond to conditions