

## NZHPA Conference 2024 - 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.	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

Ethics approval process indicated					
<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