

## NZHPA Conference 2023 - Abstract reviewing form

<b>Abstract ID</b>	
<b>Abstract Title</b>	
<b>Presentation type applied for</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral <input type="checkbox"/> Poster
<b>Reviewer</b>	

### 1. Criteria for abstract write-up

*Does the abstract adhere to the abstract preparation guideline?*

Research/audit	Circle	Service development	Circle	Case report	Circle
<b>Title</b> is succinct and clearly describes the work	0 1	<b>Title</b> is succinct and clearly describes the work	0 1	<b>Title</b> is succinct and clearly describes the case	0 1
<b>Introduction</b> Sets the scene and rationale for study	0 1 2 3	<b>Context</b> Existing problem is clearly described and rationale for change	0 1 2 3	<b>Introduction</b> Outlines the context of the case	0 1 2 3
<b>Aim</b> is clear Explicit aim/obj/hypothesis that builds from introduction	0 1 2	<b>Planned changes</b> Outline intended changes and impact	0 1 2	<b>Case description</b> Relevant patient and treatment details are presented	0 1 2 3 4 5
<b>Method</b> Research design is sound and robust, is appropriate and relate to aim. Key features are described such as study setting, subject numbers, timeframe, recruitment criteria and process, outcome measures, stats. Ethics approval process indicated	0 1 2 3 4 5	<b>Method</b> Planned change is clearly outlined and relates to problem; information on what was done, who was involved clearly described. Describe outcome measure for change and if validated	0 1 2 3 4 5	<b>Discussion</b> Mechanism of the case presentation / pharmaceutical process is clearly described and important lessons learnt	0 1 2 3 4 5
<b>Result/Discussion</b> Key findings are presented and discussed relevant to study aim/outcome/method. Study limitations are discussed	0 1 2 3 4 5	<b>Effect of change</b> Outcome post implementation reported and described clearly	0 1 2 3 4 5 6	<b>Generalisability</b> Generalisability of case to broader populations described	0 1 2 3
<b>Conclusion</b> Relates to the aim and is supported by study findings. Implications for findings are discussed	0 1 2 3 4	<b>Implication of change</b> Implication of service change is discussed. Significance and generalisability of change discussed relevant to other services	0 1 2 3	<b>Conclusion</b> Application of knowledge to future cases is outlined include new or innovative pharmacy-related contributions	0 1 2 3
<b>Total points (out of 20)</b>		<b>Total points (out of 20)</b>		<b>Total points (out of 20)</b>	

## 2. Innovation and impact

### a) Innovation and novel practice

- ☐ Unacceptable (0 points) The research / case / service outlined in the abstract is not new or novel and has been described multiple times before.
- ☐ Fair (1 point) The abstract outlines a somewhat novel topic or a new spin on previously seen work.
- ☐ Good (2 points) The research / case / service outlined in the abstract is original or novel but is not fully realised in the abstract.
- ☐ Excellent (3 points) The abstract describes a completely innovative or novel piece of work / topic which is of the utmost interest.

### b) Significance, impact and relevance to clinical or pharmacy practice

- ☐ Unacceptable (0 points) The work described in the abstract has no or minimal impact or relevance on clinical or pharmacy / health sector practice.
- ☐ Fair (1 point) The research / case / service outlined in the abstract makes some reference to the pharmacist's role and the impact to clinical or pharmacy / health sector practice but is not explicit or is only applicable in the one setting.
- ☐ Good (2 points) The work described in the abstract is a good example of how the pharmacist or health provider or health service is involved in practice and has widespread applicability.
- ☐ Excellent (3 points) The work described in the abstract shows how the pharmacist or health provider or health service is leading practice and/or collaborating with other health professionals to maximise impact on patient care.

### c) Significance, impact and relevance to reducing health inequities

- ☐ Unacceptable (0 points) The work described in the abstract has no or minimal impact or relevance to reducing health inequities.
- ☐ Fair (1 point) The research / case / service outlined in the abstract makes some reference to how pharmacy services can contribute to reducing health inequities but is not explicit or is only applicable in the one setting.
- ☐ Good (2 points) The work described in the abstract is a good example of how pharmacy services can contribute to reducing health inequities and has widespread applicability.
- ☐ Excellent (3 points) The work described in the abstract shows how the pharmacist or health provider or health service is leading practice and/or collaborating with other health professionals to reduce health inequities.

## Final scoring

Abstract write-up	/20
Innovation and novel practice	/3
Significance, impact, relevance to clinical practice	/3
Significance, impact and relevance to reducing health inequities	/3
<b>Total score</b>	<b>/29</b>
Presentation type allocated	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral <input type="checkbox"/> Poster