



## AMA Research Challenge Abstract Scoring Criteria

### Background/Objective

#### 5 rating

- The background strongly demonstrates that the literature has been reviewed.
- The background is strong, clear, and thorough, yet concise in providing an overview of the problem.
- Based on the presented background and knowledge gap, a specific, clear and testable research objective is stated.

#### 4 rating

- The background demonstrates that the literature has been reviewed.
- The background is clear and provides a thorough introduction to the problem.
- Based on the presented background and knowledge gap, a clear and testable research objective is stated.

#### 3 rating

- The background partially demonstrates that the literature has been reviewed.
- The background is clear and provides a brief introduction to the problem.
- Based on the presented background and knowledge gap, a clear and testable research objective is stated.

#### 2 rating

- The background very weakly demonstrates that the literature has been reviewed.
- The background provides a weak introduction to the problem that is not informed.
- A clear, but untestable research objective is stated.

#### 1 rating

- The background does not demonstrate that the literature has been reviewed.
- The background does not provide an overview of the problem.
- A vague, untestable research objective is stated.

### Methods/Results

#### 5 rating

- The methods provide a strong and clear explanation of the study design and are very clearly and concisely described.
- The results strictly follow the presentation of the methods.
- The results are clear and connected to the purpose of the study.
- For clinical vignette, the clinical impact of this case is strikingly novel, or innovation may fill gaps that may yet be unrealized in medical practice with appropriate relevance discussed.

#### 4 rating



- The methods provide a clear explanation of the study design and are well described.
- The results mainly follow the presentation of the methods.
- The results are clear and connected to the purpose of the study.
- For clinical vignettes, the case is an original concept or meets an unmet need in medical practice with appropriate relevance discussed.

### 3 rating

- The methods provide an adequate explanation of the study design.
- The results attempt to present findings but might be unclear or some information is missing from the results.
- The results follow the presentation of the methods.
- For clinical vignettes, some aspects of approach are original, others duplicate other efforts/studies.

### 2 rating

- The methods provide an unorganized explanation of the overall study design.
- The results attempt to present findings but might be unclear or some information is missing from the results.
- Results loosely follow the presentation of methods.
- For clinical vignettes, the case is poorly designed.

### 1 rating

- The methods provide an unclear and unorganized explanation of the study design.
- The results do not present concrete data, they are unclear findings and/or do not relate to the study purpose.
- The results do not follow the presentation of the methods.
- For clinical vignettes, does not provide any novel or relevant data.

## Discussion/Conclusion

### 5 rating

- The conclusion is fully supported by the study results and does not overstate the findings.
- Provides knowledge that likely will change action.
- For clinical vignettes, case discussion correlates with the novel finding of the presentation.

### 4 rating

- The conclusion is mostly supported by the study results.
- Provides knowledge that may change action.
- For clinical vignettes, case discussion correlates with some findings of the presentation.

### 3 rating

- The conclusion is only partially supported by the study results.
- Provides knowledge that likely will change action.
- For clinical vignettes, case discussion highlights a few elements of the presentation.

### 2 rating

- The conclusion is weakly supported by the study results.
- Provides knowledge that likely will not change action.



- For clinical vignettes, case discussion does not demonstrate or highlight any novel ideas.

#### 1 rating

- The conclusion is not supported by the study results.
- Provides knowledge that likely will not change action.
- For clinical vignettes, case discussion is common and does not provide any new input.

#### Significance/Interest to the audience

#### 5 rating

- The study will definitely enhance clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information
- The study will definitely attract the attention and interest of the audience
- The study is well-structured, logical and highlights the importance of the proposed work.

#### 4 rating

- The study will very likely enhance clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information
- The study will very likely attract the attention and interest of the audience
- The study is partially well-structured and highlights the importance of the proposed work.

#### 3 rating

- The study will somewhat likely enhance clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information.
- The study will attract the attention and interest of the audience
- The study is structured and highlights the importance of the proposed work.

#### 2 rating

- The study will not likely enhance clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information.
- The study will attract the attention and interest of a narrow audience.
- The study is weakly structured and does not highlight the importance of the proposed work.

#### 1 rating

- Not likely to enhance all/or either clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information
- The study will not attract the attention and interest of the audience
- The study demonstrates some effort to highlight the importance of the proposed work.