

Spring Meeting for Clinician Scientists in Training

Abstract submission guidelines

All abstracts accepted into the Spring Meeting's three competitions will be published in a special edition of The Lancet.

All queries should be directed to mentoring@acmedsci.ac.uk.

Note that previously published work cannot be republished as an abstract. Consent to publish should be obtained from all authors and the list of authors should be finalised before submission.

Competition options

If you submit an abstract for one of the oral competitions you can indicate whether you would like be considered for the poster competition if your abstract is not accepted for an oral competition.

Poster competition

- **Who is eligible:** Clinical academic trainees at all career stages.
- **What to submit:** Abstract (see requirements below)
- **On the day:**
 - You will discuss your poster with two separate judges.
 - You will be allocated a particular judging time slot (approximately 1 hour) and will be expected to remain at your poster for the entire hour.
 - You will be judged on research quality, poster quality and oral communication skills.
- **Prizes:**
 - Winner (The Lord Leonard and Lady Estelle Wolfson Prize): £2,500
 - 4 runners up: £500 each

Oral plenary competition

- **Who is eligible:** Pre-PhD (Foundation Year doctors and ACFs) and PhD students.
- **What to submit:** Abstract (see requirements below)
- **On the day:**
 - 3-4 finalists will be pre-selected to give a 10 minute plenary talk focused on your research followed by audience Q&A.
 - You will be judged by a panel on research quality and oral communication skills.
- **Prizes:**
 - Winner (the MRS prize): £2,500
 - Runner up: £500

Young Investigator competition

- **Who is eligible:** Postdoctoral clinical academic trainees (Clinical Lecturers, Clinician Scientist Fellows or equivalent posts)
- **What to submit:**
 - Abstract (see additional information below)
 - Research summary: a more detailed description of your research and data. **The document should be no more than 1000 words.** You may include figures, which will not add to your word count.
 - 2 page CV
 - Short description of the wider implications of your research
- **On the day:**
 - 3-4 finalists will be pre-selected for a 15 minute plenary talk focused on their research followed by audience Q&A.
 - The judging will also include a 15 minute interview with a panel, focused on the wider implications of your work.
- **Prizes:**
 - Winner (The Lancet prize): £2,500 and a chance to write an editorial for The Lancet on the wider implications of your research.
 - Runner up: £750

General advice

You will be able to **save your submission form and resume** filling it out later. At the bottom of your submission form there will be an individual link, which will only remain active for seven days. After seven days the data will be lost if not completed and submitted.

If you submit an abstract you will be asked to indicate your **top choice of competition**. If you select one of the oral competitions you will be given the opportunity to be considered for the poster competition if your abstract is not accepted for an oral competition.

You will be asked to choose the research discipline/methodology and clinical discipline that most closely reflect your current work. This will help us to match you with appropriate judges.

Abstracts

All accepted abstracts will be published in a special edition of The Lancet. Because the abstracts are being prepared for publication it is **crucial** that you **fill in the submission form in full**. Email mentoring@acmedsci.ac.uk if you have questions at any stage.

We will request the following information in the 'Abstract' section of the submission form:

- **Abstract title:** Should be descriptive and include the type of study—eg, a cross-sectional survey, a randomised controlled trial.
- **Abstract text:** The text of the abstract should be organised using the following headings.
 - **Background:**
 - **Context**

- Why the study was done, in one or two sentences.
 - **Aim**
State specific aim/s or hypothesis, if appropriate.
- **Methods:**
 - **Study design**
Indicate where the study was done—which countries and how many centres/hospitals. What was the study design—eg, randomised controlled? If appropriate, provide information about randomisation, masking, and stratification (How were participants allocated to groups? Were participants, investigators, and those assessing outcomes masked to group assignment?)
 - **Participants**
Who were they? How were they recruited? How many were studied? Were they male or female, children or adults? What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria?
 - **Interventions**
If appropriate. For example, for drugs please provide rINN, doses, route, and schedule of administration.
 - **Analysis**
 - What were the primary outcomes; how did you decide on or calculate the number of individuals to be included in the study; what statistical tests did you use? If a randomised controlled trial, was the analysis per protocol or intention to treat, or something else?
 - Details of ethics approval and patient consent. Was informed consent (written or verbal) obtained from the participants or their guardians? Who approved the study?
 - If applicable, please provide registration number and name of trial register.
- **Findings:**
 - Provide number of participants assigned and analysed in each group.
 - Describe outcomes, data, and statistical tests if appropriate. For example, for randomised controlled trials, the actual numbers and percentages for the primary outcome/s, and estimated effect size (eg, odds ratio) and its precision (eg, 95% CI). Please report SD for mean values and IQR for medians, and give exact p values unless $p < 0.0001$.
 - Any important adverse events/side-effects.
- **Interpretation:**
 - General interpretation of the results and their significance.
 - Outline limitations and strengths of the study.

Abstracts should be about 300 words in total or less. Characters limits are in place in each of the four abstract headings.

- **Funding:**
 - Source of funding. Write 'none' if you received no funding for the research.
 - ***The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that funders have given permission for the research to be published.***

Authors

The competitor registering for the Spring Meeting should be one of the authors of the abstract, although he or she does not need to be the corresponding author. You will be asked for the following information in the 'Authors' section of the submission form.

- **Corresponding author:**
 - The corresponding author is the author who will receive any queries relating to the research after it is published.
 - Provide full postal (including post or zip code) and email addresses and title for corresponding author.
- **Names and affiliations of authors:**
 - Provide full names and affiliations (name of organisation, city, state if applicable, and country) for all authors.
 - Indicate full professors.
 - Provide one degree or qualification for all authors.
- **Conflicts of interest:**
 - Declare any conflict for all authors, if none then add "I/We declare that I/we have no conflicts of interest."

Contribution of authors

- Provide a statement describing the contribution of each author in the study following the [CRediT Taxonomy of author contributions](#). All of the authors listed on the paper should be mentioned in this section at least once.
- As the submitting author will be responsible for completing this information at submission, it is expected that all authors will have reviewed, discussed, and agreed to their individual contributions ahead of this time. Contributions will be published by the Lancet with the final abstract, and they should accurately reflect contributions to the work.

Please consult the following reporting guidelines, if appropriate to the design of your study:

- Reports of randomised trials must conform to [CONSORT 2010 guidelines](#) and should include a section describing randomisation and masking within the Methods section; see also [CONSORT for Abstracts](#).
- Cluster-randomised trials must be reported according to [CONSORT extended guidelines](#)
- Randomised trials that report harms must be described according to [extended CONSORT guidelines](#)
- Studies of diagnostic accuracy must be reported according to [STARD guidelines](#)
- Observational studies (cohort, case-control, or cross-sectional designs) must be reported according to the [STROBE statement](#)
- Genetic association studies must be reported according to [STREGA guidelines](#)
- Systematic reviews and meta-analyses must be reported according to [PRISMA guidelines](#)
- To find reporting guidelines see <http://www.equator-network.org>

Additional information for Young Investigator Award applicants

Anyone wishing to be considered for the Young Investigator Award competition must fill in an additional section at the end of the submission form. You will be asked for the following information.

- **Month and year of your PhD award.**
- **A 100 word statement on the wider implications of your research.**

- This should concisely outline the main ways that your research may have an effect on other areas of research, healthcare or medicine that are not dealt with directly in your research. For example, research into the development of a new vaccine might change how patients with similar illnesses are treated and inform public health policy.
- **CV**
 - Upload your most current CV. No more than 2 pages long.
 - Word documents or pdfs are acceptable.
 - Please name the file Surname_Firstname_CV
- **Research summary**
 - Upload a research summary of no more than 1000 words. The word limit will be strictly enforced.
 - You may include figures, which will not add to your total word count.
 - The summary should go into more detail than the abstract and is an opportunity to showcase your findings and future plans for your research. **This will be crucial for the judging process of your abstract.**
 - Word documents or pdfs are acceptable.
 - Please name the file Surname_Firstname_RS