



British Society of
Rehabilitation Medicine
Promoting quality through
education and standards



Guidance for structure of Research abstracts – 2020 BSRM/SRR/ACPPLD Joint meeting

Please read these instructions carefully to ensure your abstract adheres to the submission guidelines for **research abstracts** (separate guidance is available for all other submissions). Abstracts should be limited to **250 words** and be in good English.

Format of research abstracts

Abstracts should be a **maximum length of 250 words**. The abstract submission should be in a structured format and include the following information:

- Title
- Name(s) of the author(s).
- Institutional affiliation of the author(s).

Please note that in the case of multiple authorship, the first named author should be the person who will present the paper or answer questions on the poster.

Full membership of the Society for Research in Rehabilitation is open to the first author of a Free Paper or a Poster provided they have presented the Paper or answered questions on the Poster.

Content of research abstracts

The Abstract is the only means by which a proposed paper or poster is assessed and should be complete in itself. It should include:

- **Background:** A brief outline or rationale (why the study was undertaken).
- **Method:** An outline of the research method (how the study was done).
- **Results:** A summary of the main results (what was found).
- **Discussion:** (what consequences follow, e.g. implications for practice).
- **Conclusion**

Please note that results of statistical analysis should be reported wherever this requirement applies. Statements to the effect that "The results will be presented and discussed" are not acceptable. References are not normally required and not normally expected but if given, no more than two should be included. Tables are rarely, if ever, appropriate in an abstract.

Work in Progress

Please submit 'work in progress' abstracts using the same procedure selecting 'work in progress' from the drop down list and in the results section include a statement of ethical approval obtained or being sought.

Format of abstracts (qualitative research)

Authors should refer to the general information and guidelines above. The general guidance therein applies to research abstracts. This includes the maximum permitted limit of 250 words, and the instruction that abstracts should be structured. In keeping with all research submissions, subsequent

presentation must reflect and elaborate on the abstract. Research studies or findings not referred to in the abstract should not be presented.

The section below contains specific guidance on the content of *qualitative* research abstracts.

We recognise that the nature of qualitative research makes its comprehensive communication within short abstracts a challenge. Therefore, whilst the key areas to be included within abstracts are set out below, it is recognised that emphasis on each area will vary in different cases, and that not every listed sub-area will be covered. Certain elements are likely to receive greater attention at the time of presentation than within the abstract. In particular, presentation of the paper should include sufficient empirical data to allow judgement of the conclusions drawn.

Content of qualitative research abstracts

- **Research question/objective and design:** clear statement of the research question/objective and its relevance. Methodological or theoretical perspectives should be clearly outlined.
- **Population and sampling:** who the participants were and what sampling strategies were used.
- **Methods of data collection:** clear exposition of data collection: access, selection, method of collection, type of data, relationship of researcher to subjects/setting (what data were collected, from where/whom, by whom)
- **Data analysis:** clear exposition of analytic process. Clear definitions of concepts, categories and themes, how these were developed and how they relate to data:
 - **Quality of data and analysis:** strategies to enhance quality of data analysis e.g. triangulation, respondent validation; and to enhance validity e.g. attention to negative cases, consideration of alternative explanations, team analysis, peer review panels
- **Findings:** overview of important findings, moving towards interpretation rather than simple summaries of themes where possible e.g. by linking to theory
 - **Application of critical thinking to analysis:** attention to the influence of the researcher on data collected and on analysis. Critical approach to the status of data collected
 - **Theoretical and empirical context:** evidence that design and analysis take into account and add to previous knowledge
- **Conclusions:** justified in relation to data collected, sufficient original data presented to substantiate interpretations, reasoned consideration of transferability to groups/settings beyond those studied.

SRR VERNA WRIGHT PRIZE

The best oral presentation and the best poster presentation during the year by a paid up SRR Associate Member is eligible for the Verna Wright Prize. Both prizes are £150.00.

In order to be considered for the prize, non-members whose abstracts are accepted for presentation must join the SRR as an Associate Member before the meeting at www.srr.org.uk/become-a-member

PUBLICATION

Selected (high scoring) research abstracts will be submitted for **publication in Clinical Rehabilitation**. Please note if an abstract is accepted for publication in Clinical Rehabilitation, that it may be published without further permission being sought, following notification to the first author, and that the usual copyright conditions of the journal apply, which in essence does not restrict the author at all but protects his/her/their rights.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Selection of abstracts is competitive, but the SRR Council members score abstracts independently and try to ensure that the programme reflects the multidisciplinary nature and wide-ranging interests of the society. We especially encourage submission of abstracts relating to the symposia and theme of a conference.

The adjudication process

All abstracts are seen and assessed by members of the SRR Council who grade each abstract on a scale from 0-10. Abstracts with a mean score <5 will be rejected.