

SAM 2021 POSTER COMPETITION

January 13 -16, 2021

POSTER SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Poster Abstract/Poster Submission Deadline: **Friday, December 11, 2020**

Poster Policies:

- Submissions are for the SAM 2021 Poster Competition to be held at Disney's Coronado Springs Resort January 13 - 16, 2021 during SAM 2021.
- An abstract of the poster **as well as** a PDF of the poster and the poster board entry must be submitted to the FPMA office, located at 410 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, FL 32301, and received by Friday, December 11, 2020. Questions can be submitted to FPMA via email to **posters@fpma.com**.
 - The poster abstract is a brief summary of your poster and should list the corresponding author as well as the other poster abstract submission requirements provided on page 2 of this document.
- All communications from FPMA concerning the poster competition will be made with the corresponding author who is designated on the poster abstract submission.
 - This includes important specifics for set up/break down, judging, and award announcements, which will be emailed or texted to the corresponding author only.
- The top 5 poster winners will be awarded \$750 (1st place), \$500 (2nd place), \$400 (3rd place), \$300 (4th place), or \$200 (5th place). The top poster submitter will be asked to summarize their poster at the award presentation on Saturday, January 16, 2021 during SAM 2021.
- Topics for posters should be based on lower extremity conditions/procedures/care and must include one podiatric physician as a lead author.
 - The podiatric attendings, residents, and medical students listed as authors must be APMA/FPMA members in good standing. In addition, the residents/students as well as one attending must be registered for the conference. If they are not members, they must join APMA or be removed from the competition.
- Research must be completed prior to the poster abstract submission, with a minimum follow-up of 6 months for case studies. No edits or additional authors may be added after poster abstract submission. The title in the abstract must be the same as the one displayed on the poster.
- Posters promoting a particular product should not be commercial in any way. Industry-sponsored poster abstracts should not be submitted. Do not use any commercial terminology, i.e., names/logos of any company. Logos should only include those from the respective residency program or office/hospital affiliation.

- Poster abstracts/submissions will be delivered to Disney’s Coronado Springs Resort by FPMA staff and each poster will be assigned a number. Poster setup will be provided by FPMA. Poster breakdown must take place on Saturday, January 16, 2021 by noon.
 - FPMA is not responsible for lost posters or those that have been destroyed. Individuals displaying posters are responsible for breaking down posters within the specific time frame listed above.
 - There may be an additional display of posters within the SAM 2021 virtual Exhibit Hall. These will be based on the submitted PDF of each poster; however, posters must be physically present at SAM 2021 for the judging competition.
- Posters will not be judged within categories. Our judging criteria will use a point system for overall visual impact and significance to the practice of Podiatric Medicine. The top 5 posters will be selected by a panel of judges and awards will be presented on Saturday, January 16, 2021.

POSTER ABSTRACT SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Poster Abstract Submission Elements:

(Please include each bullet point within your poster abstract)

- Title of Poster
- Corresponding Author (please include email address and cell phone number)
- Authors and Affiliations
- Format (see “Format: Definitions” below)
- Length of Case/Study Follow-up
- Levels of Evidence (see chart on page 4)
- Summative Statement
- Abstract Text (poster in summary)

Format: Definitions

- CASE STUDY refers to the collection and presentation of detailed information about a particular participant or small group. A form of qualitative descriptive research, the case study looks intensely at an individual or small participant pool, drawing conclusions only about that participant or small group confined to the presented context. Researchers emphasize a description or exploration of a general question, not specific research questions.
 - The judging criteria for the poster competition should have each section placed sequentially (i.e., purpose, literature review, case study, analysis, discussion, and references).
- SCIENTIFIC refers to the study/evaluation of a question with the formation of a hypothesis and methodology directed to address the hypothesis. Research can be prospective or retrospective. It involves gathering information, testing the hypothesis, interpretation of the data, and drawing conclusions that validate or

negate the hypothesis. Meta-analysis and systematic reviews will be accepted; however, literature reviews will not be accepted. A case series is a group of case reports greater than five subjects that typically reaches a conclusion, so the scientific research format is preferred.

- The judging criteria for the poster competition should have each section placed sequentially (i.e., purpose, methods, procedures, literature review, results, discussion, and references).

ABSTRACT DO'S:

- Submit original research or case study that has not been previously published and has a minimum of 6 months' follow-up
- Include the level of evidence (see chart on page 4)
- Complete Financial Disclosure
- List references in order of appearance, not alphabetically
- Make the poster visibly pleasing and no larger than 4' x 8'

ABSTRACT DON'TS:

- Do not use any commercial terms such as company or product name
- Do not use a student as the primary author
- Do not submit a literature review
- Do not make any changes to the research, authors, or content after abstract submission

("Levels of Evidence" chart on page 4)

Levels of Evidence for Primary Research Question

Types of Studies				
Level	Therapeutic Studies Investigating the Results of Treatment	Prognostic Studies Investigating the Effect of a Patient Characteristic on the Outcome of Disease	Diagnostic Studies Investigating a Diagnostic Test	Economic & Decision Analyses Developing an Economic or Decision Model
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-quality RCT with statistically significant difference or no statistically significant difference but narrow confidence intervals Systematic review² of Level-1 RCT (studies were homogeneous) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-quality prospective study⁴ (all patients were enrolled at the same point in their disease with ≥ 80% F/U of enrolled patients) Systematic review² of Level-1 studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing of previously developed diagnostic criteria in series of consecutive patients (w/ universally applied reference “gold” standard) Systematic review² of Level-1 studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible costs and alternatives; values obtained from many studies; multi-way sensitivity analyses Systematic review² of Level-1 studies
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesser-quality RCT (e.g., < 80% follow-up, no blinding, or improper randomization) Prospective⁴ comparative study⁵ Systematic review² of Level-2 studies or Level-1 studies w/ inconsistent results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective⁶ study Untreated controls from RCT Lesser-quality prospective study (e.g., patients enrolled at different points in their disease or < 80% F/U) Systematic review² of Level-2 studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of diagnostic criteria on basis of consecutive patients (w/ universally applied reference “gold” standard) Systematic review² of Level-2 studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible costs and alternatives; values obtained from limited studies; multi-way sensitivity analyses Systematic review² of Level-2 studies
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case-control study⁷ Retrospective⁶ comparative study⁵ Systematic review² of Level-3 studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case-control study⁷ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study of non-consecutive patients (w/out consistently applied reference “gold” standard) Systematic review² of Level-3 studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses based on limited alternatives and costs; poor estimates Systematic review² of Level-3 studies
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case series⁸ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case series 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case-control study Poor reference standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No sensitivity analyses
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert opinion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert opinion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert opinion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert opinion

1. A complete assessment of the quality of individual studies requires critical appraisal of all aspects of the study design.
2. A combination of results from two or more prior studies.
3. Studies provided consistent results.
4. Study was started before the first patient enrolled.
5. Patients treated one way (e.g., w/ arthrodesis) compared with patients treated another way (e.g., w/ arthroplasty) at the same institution.
6. Study was started after the first patient enrolled.
7. Patients identified for the study on the basis of their outcome (e.g., failed arthrodesis), called “cases”, are compared w/ those who did not have the outcome (e.g., had a successful arthrodesis), called “controls”.
8. Patients treated one way with no comparison group of patients treated another way.

Adapted from material published by the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, Oxford, UK. For more information, please see www.cebm.net.