

WFOT CONGRESS 2022

Abstract Review Guide

Introduction: Overview

This guide is intended to:

- Provide information, guidance and support to the many occupational therapists from around the world who have volunteered their time and expertise to review the abstracts for the WFOT Congress 2022
- Outline the rationale, process and outcomes of the abstract review process and provide examples of rated abstracts
- Highlight the importance of the review process to the overall success of the scientific programme

Introduction: Objectives

The objectives of this Guide are to:

- Improve consistency of ratings among reviewers
- Suggest factors for consideration when rating abstracts
- Suggest an approach to the review process
- Provide examples of rated abstracts
- Enhance the experience for the reviewer

Outcomes of the review process

A scientific programme that:

- Is of high quality and excites Congress attendees
- Reflects innovation and diversity of occupational therapy research, practice and professional issues
- Reflects a balance between research, practice, professional issues and education
- Supports the themes of the Congress
- Promotes critical reflection, dialogue and debate of key issues in occupational therapy

Overview of the review process

- Submitted abstracts are matched anonymously to two or more volunteer reviewers based on their preferred programme categories
- Abstracts are reviewed online
- Reviews that have a large difference in scores will be rated a 3rd reviewer
- Abstract and review data are submitted to the Congress Scientific Programme Committee
- Abstracts are assigned a rating of 'accepted' or 'rejected' by the committee based on ratings, comments and programme balance
- Accepted presentations are assigned to a theme/category and timeslot in the programme

Reviewer self-reflection

- Do I have sufficient knowledge in the abstract content and methodology to provide a fair review? If not, reviewer to email Congress Office to assign another reviewer to the abstract in question.
- Are my ratings based on a consideration of all aspects of the abstract review form rather than grammar and writing style (note: author may be bilingual)?
- Even though the abstract is anonymous, is there any conflict of interest for me? Congress Organiser to assign abstract to another reviewer if conflict of interest box is ticked.

Reviewer consideration for research abstracts

- Do I understand the design and methodology outlined in the abstract? Is it appropriate for answering the question?
- Do I understand the statistical terms used? Are the statistics appropriate to the research question?
- Are results reported? Abstracts with pending results will not be accepted.
- Has the significance to occupational therapy been provided?

Reviewer consideration for non-research abstracts

- Does the abstract provide new information or approach the topic in a novel way?
- Does the abstract address issues that are important to the profession?
- Is the information based on a theoretical approach?
- How will the content inform practice?

Approaches to the review

- There is no right or wrong approach
- Most reviewers read all abstracts first, before rating to get a “general feel” for the overall range
- Some reviewers then rank order the abstracts or create a grading rubric
- Reviewers then rate each abstract individually using the online rating form

Rating the abstract

- “I read them all through first, thinking initially ‘do I get a picture of what they are talking about, does it make sense?’; some are so clear, yet others I have to read several times to get at what they are saying (and that tells me lots).”
- “I honour the criteria provided, seek clarification if I am uncertain about information within or missing from the abstracts.”

- “I jot notes on each abstract and give each a quick mark. I then set aside the abstracts that I reacted to most strongly – both positively and negatively...in a day or two I re-read and re-mark each abstract in a more careful manner. I find that a bit of time for reflection helps me determine what engendered that strong positive or negative reaction on initial reading and whether that response was valid. These abstracts often have a more significant change in mark on second reading.”

Approaches to the review

- Comments can be added before or after scoring but should be consistent with the scores provided.
- Reviewers check their consistency in a variety of ways:
 - Some rate the abstracts at 2 sittings independently, then compare scores.
 - Others rank order after scoring, then compare scores to see if they are consistent with the ranking.
- Some reviewers review highly and poorly rated abstracts again to ensure fairness.

Score Sheets

- Please refer to **score sheets** for each abstract submission type on the Congress website: <https://wfotcongress2022.org/programme/reviewers>

Considerations for reviewer comments

WFOT requests that reviewers include some qualitative comments to assist the Congress Scientific Programme Committee in making decisions on the abstracts for consideration in the programme. These comments will not be released to the author.

- “I always comment. If I think another format would be better or if I have some advice re presentation, I include that. I also comment on any lack of clarity (often by asking a question) or wording problems.”
- “I recognise that some topics appeal only to a small audience, but they are interesting...I try to balance breadth of interest vs. depth of interest.”
- Consider the tone of the comments – are they constructive and helpful? Do they suggest a better approach?
- Low scores should be supported by a comment.
- A different presentation format (such as a poster format) may be suggested if the author has requested an oral for example.

Example of well-written abstract

Introduction: Partners of individuals with dementia often experience challenges with their ability to manage the daily issues that arise with being the primary caregiver. Personal stress, increased physical demands, personality changes in their partner and dealing with their own aging are common issues that partners may face. Occupational therapists are often consulted to work with the individual with dementia; however, it is often the partner that is the primary recipient of services. Little is known about how male partners are able to cope with the daily challenges of being the primary caregiver.

Objectives: The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore the lived experience of the male partners of individuals with dementia to develop an understanding of the strategies they use to support their partner at home.

Methods: Using purposive sampling, male partners of individuals with dementia were recruited for this study. Participants were individually interviewed using a semi-structured questionnaire. Interviews were audiotaped, transcribed verbatim and reviewed to develop a coding scheme and definitions. Two researchers conducted line-by-line review of the transcripts to identify themes and sub-themes that emerged from the data. Additional notes were made throughout the analysis to document further ideas and assumptions. The summary of themes was sent to participants for member checking.

Results: Data saturation was achieved after analysis of the data from twelve participants. Three sets of primary coping strategies emerged from the data and were confirmed by participants. Longing for the Past, Day-to-day and A Predictable and Unwanted Future were themes that encapsulated the finding of this study.

Conclusion: The results of this study will assist occupational therapists to understand the coping strategies that the male caregivers of individuals with dementia use to maintain their partners at home. Identifying ways to support these primary caregivers is an important role for occupational therapists as our population ages.

Quality of content

- **Introduction** (5 / 5)
The author provides justification for the study
- **Objectives** (5 / 5)
Objective of project is specific
- **Methods** (9 / 10)
Methods used to conduct the study are clear.
Partners are not necessarily the same as caregivers, although they appear to be synonymous in this study. This could be clarified.
- **Results** (10 / 10)
Results are identified
- **Conclusion** (4 / 5)
Some repetition in the conclusion that doesn't add to the abstract

Educational value

Interest and appeal to an occupational therapy audience (4 / 5)

May have a limited audience as it addresses a very specific population and area of practice.

Important contribution to research / practice / theory knowledge and / or novel or innovative contribution, relevant to the Congress theme/s (5 / 5)

An interesting topic and I am eager to hear more about the results and implications for occupational therapists working in this area, in particular I look forward to a discussion and more details on the strategies.

Although not a novel issue, the author suggests that limited work has been done to explore this issue and this anticipate that the contribution is novel.

Author does not clearly link the topic to Congress theme

Quality of written abstract

Coherent and readable (4 / 5)

Abstract is clearly worded

Uses passive voice at times

Example: Poorly written abstract

Introduction: With the increasing number of older adults “aging in place”, older adults are at risk for falls in their home. Person and environment factors can contribute to a situation that may result in injury. The result of falling can be detrimental to one’s health and quality of life as it may result in prolonged hospitalization.

Objectives: To develop an in-home falls program to reduce the incidence of falls in the well elderly.

Methods: Participants met with an occupational therapist to learn about home safety techniques on a weekly basis over a three month period. They used the Falls-Reduction Inventory to educate seniors on possible home hazards.

Results: Twelve seniors participated in the project. Participants completed an initial evaluation of hazards in their home and then worked with the OT to develop solutions to reduce the risk of falls. A total of 88 home hazards were identified by the participants. Interviews with the older adult participants suggested that they felt more capable of identifying risks in their home environment.

Conclusion: The results of this project support the involvement of occupational therapists in working with seniors on falls prevention in their home.

Quality of presentation content

Introduction (3 / 5)

The abstract highlights the issue of falls in older adults. However, clarification of the problem leading to the need to do this project would be helpful. Further background information on previous work and the gaps in that work would also assist to justify the need for this project.

Objectives (4 / 5)

The objective stated is clear; however is this the true objective of the study? By reading the methods, it appears that the project was not about program development.

Methods (4 / 10)

The methods used to address the issue are not clearly linked to the objectives of the project. For example, how were interviews used and analysed? More specific information on the methods used would be helpful for understanding how data was collected. Could you describe the “Falls-Reduction Inventory”? Further information on this inventory would assist the reader to understand how it was used in this project.

Results (4 / 10)

The statement “Participants completed an initial evaluation of hazards in their home and then worked with the OT to develop solutions to reduce the risk of falls” is better suited to the methods section as it addresses “what was done” in the study. Results of the data collected are described; however, it is difficult to interpret the results, as they do not clearly link to the methods section. Clearly linking methods and results would help the reader make this connection.

Conclusion (2 / 5)

The final statement of conclusion is not entirely consistent with objectives of the study, this makes it difficult to determine whether the project was successful. It is not clear how the results will contribute to the knowledge base of occupational therapists’ understanding of this area of practice; a strong statement about this contribution would strengthen the abstract.

Educational Value**Interest and appeal to an occupational therapy audience (5 / 5)**

This is a topic of interest to occupational therapy clinicians and the topic area would have broad appeal to the Congress delegates as it addresses a common area of OT practice.

Important contribution to research / practice / theory / knowledge and / or novel or innovative contribution, relevant to the Congress theme/s (Score out of 5)

Unfortunately, limited information and lack of clarity on the methods used to make it difficult to determine how this project can contribute to furthering OTs understanding of the problem. The author could clearly articulate the novel contributions of this project to the topic area; further development of a justification for the project in the introduction section would address this.

Quality of written abstract**Coherent and readable (2 / 5)**

The use of various terms to describe the participants (seniors, older adults, elderly) is somewhat confusing; I would suggest that the author use consistency in terms and ensure that person-first language is used. It would be beneficial to review the abstract for grammatical accuracy and clarity of writing. Use of personal pronouns is discouraged.

Paper presentation

- Information must be appropriate for a 15 minute (long oral), 8 minute (short oral) or a 3 minute (lightning talk) time frame
- The presentation should present ideas that require verbal explanation and cannot be presented effectively in a written format

Poster presentation

- Useful to present lots of data and other information that is fairly self-explanatory, or for presentation of a few key ideas.

Reviewing dilemmas:

No results

- Abstracts on works-in-progress are accepted
- Authors should provide information on preliminary results or preliminary trends if available

Well written, but poor content

- Try to address the potential significance of this work
 - *Has little work been done or reported on in this area?*
 - *Is this an emerging area of practice?*
- Check for reviewer bias – is this a content / practice area that you are familiar with?
- Ensure that the educational value section marks reflect your comments and perspective

Poorly written, but interesting content

- Evaluate the quality of writing first, then re-read the abstract to rate the quality of content.

Unfamiliar methodology or terminology

- Investigate unfamiliar terms or methods identified in the first review
- Focus on substantial methodological issues rather than details difficult to assess in a 250/300 word abstract.
- Balance judging scientific merit with the author's ability to convey their results and interpretation.
- If you feel unqualified to review a particular abstract, please advise the WFOT Congress 2022 Secretariat at WFOTCongress@thinkbusinessevents.com.au and ask that the abstract be re-assigned to another reviewer.

Acknowledgement

- The World Federation of Occupational Therapists (WFOT) thanks the Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists (CAOT) for their approval to use and adapt this document.