**Hospice UK national conference, 2022**

**Example 3: Abstract likely to be accepted**

**Title: Pet Enhancing Therapy (PET)**

**Background:** There is some evidence that pet (animal) therapy can be a positive additional, integrative therapy for hospice and palliative care patients\(^1\). Regular analysis of our service evaluation and user feedback\(^2\) identified a request from patients and families to integrate animals into their care. We explored and are evaluating the use of pets to provide an additional type of care for our patients and their families.

**Aims:** To monitor and evaluate our PET animal assisted therapy programme to see what difference it makes to: a) inpatient and day care patients, b) pre and post bereavement support for children and young people (CYP).


**Results:**

Phase 1: IPU = 12 pts (25 visits), DC = 16 pts (45 visits) CYP = 24 (32 visits)

Phase 2: IPU = 18 pts (29 visits), DC = 24 pts (61 visits) CYP = 16 (24 visits)

We saw in our outcome assessments and user feedback an associated increase in satisfaction with the hospice service with specific mentions of the benefits of PET in IPU, DC and CYP.

**Conclusion:** We believe that PET made a contribution to the positive well being of the inpatient and day care patients as well as children and young people who took part in the animal assisted therapy.
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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>
<th>Is this: Completed Work ( ) Work in progress ( x )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.N. Other</td>
<td>Pet Enhancing Therapy (PET)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>E.g. what is the rationale or gap in knowledge/practice that the work is based upon?</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim(s)</td>
<td>E.g. what does the work/project aim to achieve and for whom?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>E.g. what are/were the methods used to deliver or evaluate the work / project?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>This is an innovative subject and interestingly described. I would have liked a bit more about how they assessed outcome measures or the valid tools they used in order to increase its scores.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total abstract score is Section 1 + Section 2 =** 13 /18

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

- 2nd Choice = Oral presentation
- 1st Choice = Displayed poster
- Decline

**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.
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