****

**CCSG Annual Research Award**

Dear Members,

It is that time of year again when we announce the opening of the CCSG Annual Award. We are delighted to be able to have three prizes to offer this year with Nutrinovo continuing to sponsor our first prize. We are really grateful for this sponsorship as it will allow us to expand the award and enable more members to benefit. Thank you to Nutrinovo.

The annual award will follow the same structure as last year. **Please read the instructions carefully**. There are two opportunities to submit and present your work, one at our Annual Study Day and the other at the BDA Research Symposium for the Critical Care stream.

There will be three prizes this year

* 1st prize: £2000 cash prize (Sponsored by Nutrinovo)
* 2nd prize: £500 towards attendance at a conference of your choice.
* Best poster prize: free ticket to the CCSG Annual Study Day 2026

All award presenters will be expected to attend the annual study day in person and cover their costs (registration, travel, accommodation).

Up to 6 entries (including the winner and runner up) can automatically be submitted to the BDA research symposium (critical care stream) with the submission cost covered by the CCSG if the author chooses this option. All other submissions can still be eligible for entry into the BDA research symposium at their own cost. The winner and runner up of the CCSG award will not be eligible to win the BDA critical care research stream award but will have the opportunity to present their work to a wider audience. All submissions to the BDA research symposium of sufficient quality (as judged by the abstract reviewers) will have their abstracts published in the Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics.

Important dates:

* Initial submission deadline: Thursday 19th June 2025, 5pm
* Revision or initial outcome returned by: Friday 25th July 2025, 5pm
* Final submission: Thursday 14th August 2025, 5pm
* Final outcome: Friday 12th September 2025, 5pm

**Submission instructions**

The CCSG annual award is about showcasing the excellent research, audit and service evaluation projects that UK critical care dietitians are involved in. We are particularly interested in novel and innovative projects that have been implemented into clinical practice and shown to improve either patient care or improve the ways that dietitians work in critical care. However, we will accept any research, audit or service evaluation projects

We invite you to submit an abstract of your work by **5pm on Thursday 19th June 2025** following the guidance below. Abstracts that do not follow this guidance will not be considered for the award. We will review your abstract and provide feedback to help you achieve the highest standards. Our goal is to support you in refining your work, as high-quality abstracts submitted to the BDA Research Symposium will have the opportunity to be published in the *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*. We will review your abstract and suggest any necessary revisions by 5pm on Friday 25th July 2025.

As all submissions are marked anonymously, please submit **TWO** versions of your abstract (one anonymised without author details or affiliations and one fully completed version).

All abstracts should be submitted using the online portal found https://www.bda.uk.com/specialist-groups-and-branches/critical-care-specialist-group/annual-ccsg-research-award.html

Do not hesitate to contact Bethan Jenkins or Carys Davies) (criticalcare@bda.uk.com) with any queries or for advice pre-submission. Keep your eye on basecamp, emails and our social media channels for any updates and additional support for the award.

**Format of the abstract**

The abstract must be no longer than 1 side of A4 (including references).

Abstracts must be prepared as MS Word files only. The file should be saved as the surname and initial of the lead author followed by the submission date in the following format:

Surname Initial Day Month Year

*For example: Jones T 12 07 20*

If you are submitting more than one abstract please number the files consecutively i.e. *Jones T 12 07 20 1, Jones T 12 07 20 2, etc*.

**Layout of the abstract**

Use 11-point Arial font and have margins of 2cm for all sections except the author’s address and the reference list, which should use 10-point Arial. You may also use 10-point Arial for tables and figures.

Title: A short and informative title should be used; try to use a single statement rather than hyphenated titles or titles that pose a question. Make the title as accurate as possible and do not be too specific to your locality. For example, “Do nurses complete the MUST score on the stroke unit of St BDA’s Hospital, Peterborough?” would be better as “Observational study of nutritional screening tool completion on a stroke unit”. It is a good idea to include the type of study.

Names: Anybody who contributed significantly to the project should be an author. Authorship should be discussed with all collaborators prior to submission and the abstract should be approved by all authors prior to submission. Provide the names of all the authors in this format T Jones, A Smith, and work addresses, including the department name and the full postal address. Please give the email address of the lead author. Your position (e.g. Specialist Dietitian) and any qualifications (e.g. BSc RD) are not required. If the abstract describes a study that was conducted as part of a dissertation you should discuss the abstract submission with your supervisors. Your supervisors should be co-authors, you must ask their permission before submitting an abstract with their name as a co-author. All abstracts are anonymised before they are peer reviewed.

There should be a single line space between the author details and the body of the abstract.

The abstract should be divided into the following sections; background, methods, results, discussion and conclusion.

Background: Two or three sentences to set the context of your work and justification for why the project was necessary. Refer to published work, if relevant. The full reference goes at the end of the abstract – see below. The aim should be clearly stated at the end of the background, not in the methods. It is helpful to have a sentence that starts “The aim of this research/service evaluation/literature review was….”

Methods: Describe what you did clearly and concisely. Describe the study design (e.g. randomised controlled trial, cross-sectional survey, ethnographic study with participant observation etc). Give subjects details and how they were recruited. Explain what methods and statistical tests/qualitative analysis you used. There should be a statement about ethical approval, including a reference number, if appropriate. If ethical approval was not required for example for a service evaluation include a sentence to that effect. You may need to spend to sometime editing this section to include the information in as few words as possible.

Results: Write two or three sentences on your main findings. You can also provide a table or figure if relevant. Show the statistical significance of any differences. Tables and figures can be copied and pasted from other programmes into the template as usual. Tables can also be useful for displaying quotes from qualitative studies. Your results should relate to the aim of your research.

Discussion: Discuss your findings in two or three sentences. Explain the meaning of your results or say how they compare with what you expected or how they compare with other people's work.

Conclusion: Give your final conclusion in one sentence. Make sure your conclusion is supported by your findings.

References: In general, an abstract should need no more than 2 or 3 references. Number references consecutively in the order in which they first appear in the text using superscript Arabic numerals in parentheses, e.g. “These findings are consistent with previously published data (1)” References should be listed in a separate section at the end of the paper, in numerical order using the Vancouver system. If an article has more than three authors only the names of the first three authors should be given followed by ‘et al.’ Full referencing guidelines are available on the journal web site: [*http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291365-277X/homepage/ForAuthors.html*](https://protect.checkpoint.com/v2/___http%3A//onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%2A28ISSN%2A291365-277X/homepage/ForAuthors.html___.bXQtcHJvZC1jcC1ldXcyLTE6dW5pdmVyc2l0eWhvc3BpdGFsc291dGhhbXB0b246YzpvOjE1YTM1MDUyNTYyNmQzZjY3YjdiMzMyY2QxNjg5NzYzOjY6YmI2YTo3ODE2ODFkZDA3ZWM2MWYxYWZlNzg3NTIxOTg5ZDJlNGE3ZTg1ODJjM2MzMWEwZTYwYzBkYmNiOWFlYmZkMzIyOnA6VDpO)

Overall presentation: Make sure these guidelines have been followed. Use appropriate language, “people with diabetes” uses more words than “diabetics” but avoids stigma.

Marking: Marks will be given for each of the categories above except “names” and marking will be completed anonymously.

The top 4 rated abstracts will be chosen to give an oral presentation of their work at the CCSG annual study day. These will be presented as a 7-minute presentation with 3 minutes for questions. Should the corresponding / lead author be unable to attend the study day in person, one of the listed co-authors can present as long as they are a CCSG member. The final marks will be a combination of the points awarded for the abstract and for the presentation. The winner will receive 1st prize (£2000 sponsored by Nutrinovo) and the runner up 2nd prize (£500 towards a conference from CCSG).

The top 6 remaining abstracts will be presented as an e-poster during the study day. This will include a 3-minute presentation with 2 minutes for questions. The winner of the poster session will receive free entry to the study day next year.

These numbers may be amended pending the number of submissions that we receive.

**Additional expectation:** Winners of each section may be asked towrite a short report for the CCSG newsletter with an overview of the conference that was attended/study day with the prize money.