

## Author Instructions for Abstract Submission – PUNS 2022

### Guidelines

Abstract Reviews are blinded. Do not include any identifiers of authors or institutional affiliations within the title, abstract or objectives.

- Spell out abbreviations, acronyms or initials with first use.
- Proofread the submission carefully to ensure correct spelling and grammar; points are deducted for misspelled words and incorrect grammar. Revisions of a submitted abstract will not be accepted.
- All sections of the abstract must be completed upon submission, submissions with sections left blank or “pending results” will not be reviewed. It is NOT acceptable to state that "The results will be discussed." Inclusion of specific outcomes data is necessary for all abstracts.
- A PUNS member must either sponsor your abstract or be an author on a submitted abstract (they do not have to be the presenter)

The PUNS Research Special Interest Group will determine the format of the presentation. The total number of abstracts allowed to be presented by the same author is 3. Accepted abstracts are assigned for presentation at a podium session or a poster session.

The following information will need to be included in your abstract submission:

- Title
- Name, institution and email for all authors
- Presenters name, institution, email and phone number
- Presenter must disclose any relevant financial relationships or potential conflicts of interest
- Abstract with the following headings: Introduction, Material and Methods, Results, Conclusion (500 word limit)
- Authors must select a category from the provided list that the abstract fits best with, either General Research or Quality Improvement

Scoring will be done on the scale below:

5	Excellent
4	Very Good
3	Good
2	Fair
1	Poor
Conflict of Interest	COI

Reviewers will be considering the following when scoring abstracts:

- 1) Are the authors asking an important research question?
- 2) Does the research design allow the authors to answer their research question without a high risk of bias or error?
- 3) Did the authors gather data that is sufficient (in terms of quality, sample size, etc.) to answer their research question?
- 4) Is the authors' interpretation of their data appropriate?
- 5) Most important: does this abstract pass the “so what” test? In other words, at the end of the day, is this abstract going to have an impact on urologic care of children? Does this abstract make our specialty better?

**Submission deadline: July 18**

**Reviewer scoring deadline: August 8**

**Author notifications: August 26**