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Example 1: Abstract will not be accepted

Title: Pet Enhancing Therapy (PET)
We saw the need to use the pets that staff and visitors brought into the hospice to provide a different type of care for our patients and their families. We believe that this made a significant difference to the experience of patients and their families. Over the period of time that the pets visited we saw an increase in satisfaction from patients and families, a feeling of wellbeing and community as well as improvement in bereavement needs of children and young people using our service. We evaluated the experience, audited our documentation and fed back into our service, recommendations from the audit and evaluation. In our presentation we will show how we did this, lessons learnt and recommendations for the future and why we are still providing and evaluating the service.
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### Hospice UK Conference 2022: Abstract scoring template

All abstracts are assessed and scored under the following headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer name</th>
<th>Abstract title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.N. Other</td>
<td>Pet Enhancing Therapy (PET)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Is this:** Completed Work ( ) Work in progress ( X )

*You can add further thoughts/notes you wish to highlight to accompany your score in the ‘Additional Comment’ section below.*

**Is the work:** Audit [A], Quality Improvement [QI], Research [R] or Unclear / Uncertain / Other [U] (please state).

*See foot of page 2 for brief descriptions of these study types.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References included (Yes or No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1: Abstract content - score each section below**

- **Not at all described= 0**
- **Not much described = 1**
- **Well described = 2**
- **Very well described = 3**

**Background** *E.g. what is the rationale or gap in knowledge/practice that the work is based upon?*

| 0 |

**Aim(s)** *E.g. what does the work/project aim to achieve and for whom?*

| 1 |

**Methods** *E.g. what are/were the methods used to deliver or evaluate the work / project?*

| 1 |

**Results** *E.g. what are/were the anticipated results and how will they make a difference? Note, for Work in progress abstracts there may be no results to report in which case, score 0*

| 1 |

**Conclusions** *E.g. do the conclusions and recommendations seem logical from the completed or anticipated results? Note; if work is still in progress there may be no conclusion if so, score zero and make a note in the Additional Comment section.*

| 0 |

**Section 2: How innovative or of interest do you think this abstract is?** *(max 3 points)*

- **Very = 3**
- **Quite = 2**
- **Not much = 1**
- **Not at all = 0**

| 2 |

**Comment**

*This is a very interesting subject but unfortunately I am unable to assess it for scoring because it does not follow the suggested format headings and the activity is not well described. It would be helpful to use headings, descriptions and full word count (300 words)*

**Total abstract score is Section 1 + Section 2 =**

| 5 /18 |

**Your recommendation (please indicate your 1st and 2nd choice)**

- Oral presentation
- Displayed poster
- Decline x

**Additional comment:** *Please use this section to note anything else that you feel is of importance e.g.*

- Abstracts which you want to particularly recommend for oral presentation or poster - or to be declined.
- Abstracts for which you want to explain more about why you have made a recommendation.
- Anything else you want to say about your submitted scores and comments.

*Use this section also to note a score of zero for work in progress which does not have Results / Conclusions content.*

Suggest declining as not enough information provided in this abstract.
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