

Ranking criteria for scientific committee

Rating Abstracts	
Importance of the topic (0-1 points; 0=no, 1=yes)	
1. The study is relevant to urological nursing	
2. The topic is new/innovative	
Originality of the abstract (0-1 points; 0=no, 1=yes)	
3. Science-oriented: Research gap or rationale is described; Practice-oriented: Need for practice-development is described	
Quality of the abstract (0-1 points; 0=no, 1=yes)	
4. Aim(s) of study / project is / are described	
5. Objective(s) of study / project is / are described	
6. Science-oriented: Research question(s) is / are described; Practice-oriented: Process of project is described	
7. Materials & methods: Science-oriented: study design is described; Practice-oriented: patient population is described	
8. Materials & methods: Science-oriented: sample is described; Practice-oriented: - (0 points)	
9. Materials & methods: setting is explicitly described	
10. Materials & methods: Ethical aspects are considered if necessary according to design	
11. Science-oriented: Materials & methods: recruiting/sampling process is described; Practice-oriented: - (0 points)	
12. Materials & methods: Data collection process is explicitly described	
13. Materials & methods: Appropriate data analysis is explicitly described	
14. Results are described and correspond to the aim	
15. Science-oriented: Conclusion(s) is / are described (What does the results add to the existing knowledge); Practice-oriented: Implications for practice are described	
Implications (0-1 points; 0=no, 1=yes)	
16. Science-oriented: Implications for nursing research are described; Practice-oriented: Potential implications for nursing practice are described	
	Max. 16 points