Title: Pet Enhancing Therapy (PET)

Background: 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 know from the evidence that pet or animal therapies make a difference to people in hospice and palliative care.

Aims: To monitor and evaluate our PET programme and to see what difference it made to care.

Methods: In 2017 – 2018 we provided PET to 110 patients, children and young people. We evaluated the experience, audited our documentation and fed back into our service recommendations from the audit and evaluation.

Results: 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 the bereavement of children and young people who use our service.

Conclusion: We believe that this made a significant difference to the experience of patients and their families. 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.

186 words
# 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.

References included (Yes or No)

N

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all described= 0</th>
<th>Not much described = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well described = 2</td>
<td>Very well described = 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

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

1

**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.

1

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very = 3</th>
<th>Quite = 2</th>
<th>Not much = 1</th>
<th>Not at all = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

This is a very interesting subject and does helpfully include headings. Unfortunately I am unable to assess it fully for scoring because it is not well described under any of the sections. Using the full word count allowance would help with this.

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

7 / 18

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

Oral presentation | Displayed poster | 1st Choice = 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.*

An interesting subject but not enough information to score.

**Acknowledgements:** Based upon work originally devised by Dr Sarah Russell, 2018.