

### Children's research Forum in person event Autumn 2024

These marking criteria will be used to evaluate abstracts submitted for LCRF events. The criteria evaluate each abstract based on five key aspects, each rated from 0 to 3. It assesses the clarity of the aims and objectives, the justification and rigor of the methods used, the presentation and interpretation of results, the consistency of the discussion and conclusions with the data, and the potential impact and applicability of the study to clinical practice. A score of 3 indicates thorough and clear explanations, robust methods, well-interpreted results, coherent discussions, and significant potential impact. Lower scores reflect progressively less clarity, justification, and potential impact, with a score of 0 indicating fundamental deficiencies in these areas.

If you have specific questions about the marking criteria, please contact [lyneschofield@nhs.net](mailto:lyneschofield@nhs.net)

Criteria/score	3	2	1	0
<b>Clarity of aims and objectives</b>	Clear aims and objectives, appropriate to the research question / topic	Aims and objectives adequately explained, but could be a bit clearer.	Poor explanation	Aims and objectives cannot be understood or are not mentioned
<b>Do the methods / analysis enable the questions to be answered?</b>	methods/analysis are clearly explained, rigorous and appropriate to the topic/research question	adequate explanation, justifiable	poor justification or reporting for analysis / methods used	Incorrect or inappropriate methodology for the research question
<b>Are results presented and interpreted appropriately</b>	data/findings are presented and interpreted clearly	data/findings presented adequately	data/findings briefly presented but lack adequate detail	Data and/or findings unclear or misinterpreted
<b>Are the discussion/conclusion consistent with the data/findings?</b>	Findings discussed well, clarity on strengths/ weakness and clearly on messages. Inference of further questions/work	Some interpretation, but not full	Poor explanation of findings of research/activity with poor inference of further questions/work	Findings of research or activity not explained
<b>What is the potential impact</b>	Significant, likely to be implemented widely	Some potential impact	Little potential impact, unlikely to be implemented	No potential impact
<b>Funding acknowledged</b>			Yes/ stated if not relevant	No
<b>Ethnics statement</b>			Yes/ stated if not relevant	No