

Score Guideline for Tuoren International Exchange Program and Well Lead Abstract Awards

I. WAMM2019 abstract (40%)

Abstracts should describe work that develops, delivers or evaluates the delivery of anesthesia related to airway management. The award will be selected based on the scientific significance, innovation, approach, and relevance to airway management by panel of experts of WAMM and IAMS.

CASE REPORT (TOTAL MARKS – 40)

| Categories of Mark Distribution | | Marks |
|---|------------|-------|
| TITLE/BACKGROUND (Max. marks - 5) | | |
| Relevant to airway | 0-1 | |
| Title - Specific, adequate and concise, describes the core message of the case | 0-1 | |
| Background of the issue(s) explained | 0-1 | |
| Easy to understand the objectives of the abstract | 0-1 | |
| Patient consent | 0-1 | |
| CLARITY OF CASE DESCRIPTION (Max. marks - 8) Appropriate details of the case, including demography, assessment, findings, investigations and so on. Mentions intervention in detail or describes the dose, timing, and route of drugs. | | |
| Disorganized. Difficult to comprehend | 1 | |
| Adequate presentation. Fairly clear. Some incomplete/ambiguous information. | 5 | |
| Clear. Ordered. Concise. No ambiguities. Includes all important information. | 8 | |
| DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION (Max. marks - 9) | | |
| Significance/ Impact on clinical practice | 1-4 | |
| No significance whatsoever. Highly irrelevant to clinical practice. | 1 | |
| Very poor significance and relevance to clinical practice. | 2 | |
| Quite significant. Of some importance to clinical practice. | 3 | |
| Highly significant. Very important and relevant to clinical practice. | 4 | |
| Literature Review - Adequate literature review pertinent to the case | 0-2 | |
| Mentions limitations related to case | 0-1 | |
| Conclusion - Implication of case with a key message | 0-2 | |
| NOVELTY (Max. marks - 15) | | |
| Previously well reported, "Nothing new" | 0 | |
| Commonly reported event - Of local interest only | 5 | |
| Some originality. Been reported before but has some unique features | 10 | |
| Highly unique case. Never previously reported | 15 | |
| QUALITY OF WRITING (Max. marks - 3) | | |
| Word Limit | 0-1 | |
| Quality (1-2) | | |
| Poorly written. Hard to understand, idiosyncratic phrasing, or awkward abbreviations | 0 | |
| Generally, well written. Has one or two grammatical/typological errors. | 1 | |
| Perfect grammar, no errors, very clear expression of ideas. | 2 | |
| TOTAL MARKS | | |

Original Research/Audit/Survey (Total Marks – 40)

| Categories of Score Distribution | | MARKS |
|--|-----|-------|
| TITLE & BACKGROUND (Max. marks - 4) | | |
| Study relevant to submitted category | 0-1 | |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| Title specific, adequate and concise | 0-1 | |
| Rationale/Background - Context made clear, scientific rationale clearly stated | 0-1 | |
| Clarity of Objectives (0-1) Stated objectives were poorly chosen, or not clearly stated | 0 | |
| Aims, objectives, hypotheses or research question(s) clearly stated | 1 | |
| METHODOLOGY (Max. marks - 8) | | |
| Choice of approach (0-2) Methodology ill-conceived or poorly executed. Design did not test stated hypothesis/objectives. | 0 | |
| Chosen study design was sub-optimal but did test the stated hypothesis/objectives | 1 | |
| Chosen study design was the best feasible method for testing the stated hypothesis/objectives | 2 | |
| (For Survey only) Ambiguous or irrelevant questions. | 0 | |
| Some ambiguity. | 1 | |
| Clear unambiguous questions | 2 | |
| Methodology Description - Recruitment method(s), sample population(s), methods of data collection mentioned, duration of study, inclusion and exclusion criteria, sample size | 0-3 | |
| Ethics Committee Approval mentioned | 0-1 | |
| Statistical Methods (0-2) Skip this question because statistics are not applicable | X | |
| Statistical methods are technically flawed. | 0 | |
| Statistical methods are mentioned and correct. | 2 | |
| RESULTS (Max. marks - 8) | | |
| Presentation (0-3) Completely disorganized. Difficult to comprehend | 0 | |
| Ambiguous and Disjointed. Tables/figures poorly explained. Incomplete information | 1 | |
| Adequate presentation. Fairly clear. Some incomplete information. | 2 | |
| Clear. Ordered. Concise. No ambiguities | 3 | |
| Validity (0-3) A.) Observational Study Vulnerable to bias/confounding, or invalid data acquisition | 1 | |
| Bias/confounding controlled with some shortcomings | 2 | |
| Excellent control of bias and confounding. | 3 | |
| B.) Clinical Trial Not randomized for main outcome, or faulty randomization | 1 | |
| Randomized for main outcome, vulnerable to bias or poor blinding | 2 | |
| Appropriately randomized, blinded, and controlled | 3 | |
| C.) Survey Very weak, unrepresentative survey. Very poor response rate (<50%). | 0 | |
| Survey with barely adequate response rate (50-60%). Local relevance only | 1 | |
| Reasonable survey with good representation and response rate (>70%) with some wider relevance to national practice. | 2 | |
| National survey with good representation, response rate (>80%). | 3 | |
| D.) Audit No audit. No purpose. No clear attempt to improve or assure practice | 0 | |
| No clear audit. Survey with only local relevance. No clear standards or evidence of plan | 1 | |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| to change practice and re audit | | |
| True audit with comparison against recognized standard. Evidence of plan to change practice and re audit. Mainly of local relevance | 2 | |
| Clear objective with appropriate standards, reviewed practice against standards and re audit after an intervention. Applicable to other than local practice. | 3 | |
| Statistical Representation (0-2) | | |
| p-values not mentioned | 0 | |
| p-values mentioned for comparative analysis | 1 | |
| Clear indication of precision, favoring confidence intervals over p-values | 2 | |
| CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION (Max. marks - 6) | | |
| Significance/ Impact/ relevance to clinical practice (0-3) | | |
| Highly irrelevant to clinical practice. | 0 | |
| Very poor significance and relevance to clinical practice. | 1 | |
| Quite significant results. Of some importance to clinical practice. | 2 | |
| Highly significant results. Very important and relevant to clinical practice, topic or its foreseeable progeny, is relevant to <i>every anesthesiologist</i> | 3 | |
| Conclusions clear and concise | 0-1 | |
| Conclusions reflect the aims and objectives | 0-1 | |
| Conclusions supported by the results presented | 0-1 | |
| NOVELTY (Max. marks - 12) | | |
| Previously well described, "Nothing new" | 0 | |
| Some originality. Been studied before but has some unique features | 6 | |
| Highly unique study. Never previously reported | 12 | |
| QUALITY OF WRITING (Max. marks - 2) | | |
| Poorly written. Hard to understand, idiosyncratic phrasing, or awkward abbreviations | 0 | |
| Perfect grammar, no errors, very clear expression of ideas. | 1 | |
| Word Limit | 0-1 | |
| TOTAL MARKS | | |

II. Experience and achievement on the teaching, training, research and publication in the area of airway management according to the personal material submitted (40%)

| Item | Max. Marks | Marks |
|---|------------|-------|
| Reputation and impact of department of local institution regarding airway management | 2 | |
| Publication in airway management | 6 | |
| Funding related to airway management | 4 | |
| Patents related to airway management | 4 | |
| Award obtained at airway management skill competition | 4 | |
| Appointment to academic society of airway management | 4 | |
| Participation in edition or translation of publications or books about airway management | 4 | |
| Participation in airway management meetings, including meeting organization, submission of material, poster presentation and oral communication | 8 | |

| | | |
|--|-----------|--|
| Reason for application for the exchange program and intended work on airway management in the future | 4 | |
| Total Marks | 40 | |

III. English Proficiency (20%)

The award candidates will be ranked by the previous academic score and the top 10 will be evaluated for English proficiency based on the online interview. See attachment of English assessment form.

| | Low 1 pts | Low Intermediate 2 pts | High Intermediate 4 pts | Advanced 5 pts |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Clarity | <p>Low</p> <p>-All answers are awkward and incomprehensible.</p> <p>-Student is always or often difficult to hear.</p> | <p>Low Intermediate</p> <p>-Answers are awkward and do not use the target language properly</p> <p>-Student is difficult to hear at times.</p> | <p>High Intermediate</p> <p>-Answers are awkward at times, but always comprehensible and using the target language.</p> <p>-Student is bit difficult to hear.</p> | <p>Advanced</p> <p>-Answers are clear and comprehensible, and use the target language at all times</p> <p>-Student is not difficult to hear.</p> |
| Pronunciation | <p>Low</p> <p>-Student's pronunciation, inflection, and/or expression is incomprehensible.</p> | <p>Low Intermediate</p> <p>-Student's pronunciation, inflection, and/or expression inhibits understanding.</p> | <p>High Intermediate</p> <p>-Student's pronunciation, inflection, and/or expression is understandable with some clear errors.</p> | <p>Advanced</p> <p>-Student's pronunciation/ inflection, and/or expression is understandable. Almost no errors.</p> |
| Fluency | <p>Low</p> <p>-Unable to answer</p> <p>-Much effort is required to maintain the conversation</p> | <p>Low Intermediate</p> <p>-Some effort is required to maintain the conversation because of a few long pauses. (3-4 pauses)</p> | <p>High Intermediate</p> <p>-A bit of effort is required to maintain the conversation or interview because of some pauses. (1-2 pauses)</p> | <p>Advanced</p> <p>-Student acts as a facilitator, helping the conversation's or interview's flow and development.</p> <p>-No pauses are present. (0 pauses)</p> |
| Comprehension | <p>Low</p> <p>-Student shows no sign of comprehension.</p> <p>-Many questions are repeated more than one time.</p> | <p>Low Intermediate</p> <p>-Student shows little comprehension of questions.</p> <p>-A few questions are repeated more than one time. (3-4 questions repeated)</p> | <p>High Intermediate</p> <p>-Student understands most of what is asked of him/her.</p> <p>-Some questions are repeated more than one time. (1-2 questions repeated)</p> | <p>Advanced</p> <p>-Student fully understands the questions which are asked and answers correctly.</p> <p>-All questions are only asked once. (0 questions repeated)</p> |
| Use of Target Vocabulary | <p>Low</p> <p>-No answer</p> <p>-Vocabulary used is not appropriate to answer the questions and to complete the prompt</p> <p>-Hardly a variety of vocabulary is used because many words are repeated. (5 or more words)</p> | <p>Low Intermediate</p> <p>-Target vocabulary is not used</p> <p>-Additional vocabulary used is sometimes not appropriate to answer the questions and to complete the prompt</p> <p>-Not much variety of vocabulary is used because a few words are repeated. (3-4 words)</p> | <p>High Intermediate</p> <p>-Target vocabulary is not used</p> <p>-Additional vocabulary used is mostly appropriate to answer the questions and to complete the prompt</p> <p>-A variety of vocabulary is used, but some words are repeated. (1-2 words)</p> | <p>Advanced</p> <p>-Target vocabulary is used and is appropriate to answer the questions and to complete the prompt</p> <p>-A variety of vocabulary is used. (0 words)</p> |