

Abstract Marking Criteria

Research

Research - Quality of method and results	Marks (Max 4)
Good – Clear and accurate	4
Fair	1-3
Poor – Errors or unclear	0
Research – Originality / novelty	Marks (Max 3)
Good – includes new findings	3
Fair - similar to other published work but some new information	1-2
Poor – no new information	0
Research - Applicability and interest / relevance to wider perinatal	Marks (Max 3)
community	
Good - relevant to many others	3
Fair - relevant to some	1-2
Poor - not relevant to other units	0

Case studies

Case Study - Quality of Writing	Marks (Max 3)
Good – Clear and accurate 3	3
Fair - Outline of case but missing key information / data 1-2	1-2
Poor – Errors 0	0
Case Study - Quality of discussion and literature search	Marks (Max 4)
Good – includes relevant literature	4
Fair - some attempt to explore literature	1-3
Poor – missing major relevant literature	0
Case Study - Applicability and interest / relevance to wider perinatal	Marks (Max 3)
community	
Good - relevant to many others 3	3
Fair - relevant to some 1-2	1-2
Poor - not relevant to other units 0	0

BAPM Conference Abstract Marking

Quality Improvement

Quality Improvement - Use of QI Methodology	Marks (Max 3)
Good – clear and accurate, links to BAPM NSQI or other Perinatal KPI	3
Fair – some reference to QI methodology but not clearly structured, or full QI	1-2
cycle not completed.	
Poor – no reference to QI methodology framework	0
Quality Improvement - Improved outcomes - demonstrable sustained	Marks (Max 4)
improvement in care	
Good – well evidenced with re-audit or re-evaluation	4
Fair – limited evidence, or poor quality	1-3
Poor – no attempt to demonstrate sustained outcomes	0
Quality Improvement - Applicability and interest / relevance to wider	Marks (Max 3)
perinatal community	
Good – relevant to many others	3
Fair – relevant to some	1-2
Poor – not relevant to other units	0

Improving Family or Staff Experience

Quality of writing / description of project or intervention	Marks (max 3)
Good – clear and accurate	3
Fair - outline included but missing key data	1-2
Poor – errors or unclear	0
Demonstration of improved outcomes and / or improvement in family	Marks (max 4)
or staff experience	
Good – well evidenced with re-audit or re-evaluation	4
Fair – Anecdotal / common sense improvements shown	1-3
Poor – no demonstration to show sustained improvements	0
Applicability and interest / relevance to wider perinatal community	Marks (max 3)
Good – relevant to many others	3
Fair – relevant to some	1-2
Poor – not relevant to other units	0