The Academy of Medical Sciences

Clinical Academics in Training Annual Conference (CATAC)

8th November 2018

Guidelines for abstract submission

Competitions

There are three competitions taking place at CATAC 2018. They are all a great opportunity to present your research and gain exposure in a supportive environment.

You will be able to indicate on the submission form whether you would like your abstract to be considered for the poster competition, if it isn't selected for an oral presentation, and whether you would like to attend the event if your abstract isn't selected for any competition.

Maximum one abstract submitted per person as a competitor, there is no limit on the number of abstracts you can be listed on as an author.

Abstract submission will close at 12pm on Monday 16th July 2018.

1. Poster Competition

This competition is for all researchers with clinical qualifications, if selected you will be asked to prepare a poster to present at the conference.

The posters will be grouped by broad research categories and there will be a 1 hour session at the conference for two judges, the competitors in that category and other attendees to visit each poster together. You will have 2 minutes to present your poster to the group and 1 minute to answer questions.

The judges will score each poster in the group and there will be 1 winner, who will get £1000, and 1 runner up, who will get £250, from each group.

The criteria for scoring are: quality of research (hypothesis, methodology, results, interpretation), written communication (including poster layout and visual look) and oral communication (including ability to answer questions).

2. Pre-Doctoral Plenary Competition

This competition is for researchers with clinical qualifications who have not yet passed a PhD viva (at the abstract submission closing date, 16 July 2018). If selected you will be asked to prepare a 5 minute oral presentation, to be followed by 2 minutes of questions from the audience.

Your presentation should cover: research question(s) you are aiming to answer, relevance of the work, results you have so far, and the wider implications of the work.

A panel of judges will score the presentations and there will be 1 winner, who will get £1500, and 1 runner up, who will get £500.

The criteria for scoring are: quality of research (hypothesis, methodology, results, interpretation), presentation quality (slide layout and text, talk structure, timekeeping), and oral communication (ability to engage audience and answer questions).

3. Post-Doctoral Plenary Competition

This competition is for researchers with clinical qualifications who have passed their PhD viva (at the abstract submission closing date, 16 July 2018). If selected you will be asked to prepare a 10 minute oral presentation, to be followed by 5 minutes of questions from the audience.

Your presentation should cover: research question(s) you are aiming to answer, relevance of the work, results you have so far, and the wider implications of the work.

A panel of judges will score the presentations and there will be 1 winner, who will get £2500, and 1 runner up, who will get £750.

The criteria for scoring are: quality of research (hypothesis, methodology, results, interpretation), presentation quality (slide layout and text, talk structure, timekeeping), oral communication (ability to summarise and explain research succinctly, ability to engage audience and answer questions), and knowledge and understanding of the wider implications of your research.

General advice

You will be able to save your submission form and resume filling it out later. At the bottom of your submission form there will be an individual link, which will remain active for 30 days. After 30 days the data will be lost if not completed and submitted.

All queries should be directed to elizabeth.benedikz@acmedsci.ac.uk.

Abstract

You will be asked to complete the following sections. Please define any abbreviations used at their first mention.

Title

This should be descriptive and include the type of study – e.g. a cross-sectional survey, a randomised controlled trial.

Background

This should include:

- Context
  Why the study was done, in one or two sentences.

- Aim
  State specific aim/s or hypothesis, if appropriate.

Maximum 500 characters.

Methods

This should include:

- Study design
  Indicate where the study was done – which countries and how many centres/hospitals. What was the study design – e.g. randomised controlled? If appropriate, provide information about randomisation, masking, and stratification (How were participants allocated to groups? Were participants, investigators, and those assessing outcomes masked to group assignment?).

- Participants
  Who were they? How were they recruited? How many were studied? Were they male or female, children or adults? What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria?

- Interventions
  If appropriate. For example, for drugs please provide rINN, doses, route, and schedule of administration.

- Analysis
  What were the primary outcomes; how did you decide on or calculate the number of individuals to be included in the study; what statistical tests did you use? If a randomised controlled trial, was the analysis per protocol or intention to treat, or something else?

- Details of ethics approval and patient consent. Was informed consent (written or verbal) obtained from the participants or their guardians? Who approved the study?

- If applicable, please provide registration number and name of trial register.

Maximum 500 characters.

Findings

This should include:

- Number of participants assigned and analysed in each group.

- Outcomes, data, and statistical tests if appropriate. For example, for randomised controlled trials, the actual numbers and percentages for the primary outcome/s, and estimated effect size (e.g., odds ratio) and its precision (e.g., 95% CI). Please report SD for mean values and IQR for medians, and give exact p values unless p<0·0001.

- Any important adverse events/side-effects.

Maximum 800 characters.

Interpretation

This should include:

- General interpretation of the results and their significance.
- Outline limitations and strengths of the study.

Maximum 500 characters.

Additional information for the Post-Doctoral Plenary Competition

You will be asked to complete a statement on the wider implications of your research. This should concisely outline the main ways that your research may have an effect on other areas of research, healthcare or medicine that are not dealt with directly in your research. For example, research into the development of a new vaccine might change how patients with similar illnesses are treated and inform public health policy.

Maximum 800 characters.

Contribution of authors

You will be asked to provide a statement describing the contribution of each author in the study following the CRediT Taxonomy of author contributions. All of the authors listed should be mentioned in this section at least once.

As the submitting author will be responsible for completing this information at submission, it is expected that all authors will have reviewed, discussed, and agreed to their individual contributions ahead of this time.

Please consult the following reporting guidelines, if appropriate to the design of your study

- Reports of randomised trials must conform to CONSORT 2010 guidelines and should include a section describing randomisation and masking within the Methods section.
- Cluster-randomised trials or randomised trials that report harms must be reported according to CONSORT extended guidelines.
- Studies of diagnostic accuracy must be reported according to STARD guidelines.
- Observational studies (cohort, case-control, or cross-sectional designs) must be reported according to the STROBE statement.
- Genetic association studies must be reported according to STREGA guidelines.
- Systematic reviews and meta-analyses must be reported according to PRISMA guidelines.
- To find reporting guidelines see: http://www.equator-network.org