REVIEW OF CONFERENCE ABSTRACT

This station assesses the trainee’s ability to:

- Critically appraise a scientific abstract
- Use professional, scientific and clinical skills to make a decision, to communicate clearly and concisely in an organised way
- Demonstrate time management skills.

At this station the trainee will be asked to review an abstract that has been submitted for a local Healthcare Science Conference. The trainee will be asked to make a decision about whether to accept or reject the abstract for the conference. You will ask them for their decision and for a detailed justification of their decision using a set of structured questions. Please keep to these questions and do not prompt the trainee any further.

Please ensure that a copy of the trainee instructions together with a copy of the abstract, the abstract submission guidelines and some notepaper and pens are available for the trainee on the desk. Please remove any notes made by the previous trainee and reset the desk prior to the entry of the next trainee.

The trainee should be given 6 minutes to review the abstract. After 6 minutes you should ask the trainee for their decision followed by the structured questions to enable them to justify their decision.

The trainee may use their notes to aid their response but you will be marking only on their verbal response.

Structured questions to ask the trainee:

- How does the abstract meet or not meet the required structure as set out in the guidelines?
- How well does the abstract set out the detail of the research question being asked?

Please go to next page for more instructions…
• What is your opinion of the methods used and how well were they described?
• How well were the results presented?
• Does the evidence presented justify the conclusions that have been drawn?
• Is there anything else you wish to comment on regarding how well the abstract meets (or doesn't meet) the guidelines?
• In your opinion do you think the abstract should be accepted or rejected?
REVIEW OF CONFERENCE ABSTRACT

Your Trust is organising a Healthcare Science Conference. You have been asked to help by reviewing one abstract and commenting on its worthiness for presentation at the conference.

In this station you will be given the following resources:

- The abstract that has been submitted for the Healthcare Science Conference.
- The guidelines that your Trust is using to evaluate each abstract that has been submitted for this conference. You should use these guidelines to inform your decision whether to accept or reject the abstract.
- Note paper which you can use for recording your thoughts about the worthiness of the abstract to aid your decision making and discussion with the assessor (this will not be marked).

You will have 6 minutes to read through the abstract and the conference submission guidelines and to make a decision about whether to accept or reject this abstract for this conference.

After 6 minutes, the assessor will ask you for your decision followed by a series of structured questions to allow you to justify your decision.

The assessor will be marking you on the analysis of the abstract against the guidelines and how you communicate the reasons for your decision. Any notes you have made will not be assessed.
ABSTRACT SUBMITTED TO HEALTHCARE SCIENCE
CONFERENCE 2015

Title
A study to explore the relationship between patient anxiety prior to attending hospital and subsequent patient satisfaction and how this is affected by additional communications

ABSTRACT

Background:
Patient anxiety can be potentially serious when it leads to high levels of distress. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this can be reduced by additional communication. We sought to establish whether verbal communication from a healthcare scientist had a measurable impact on anxiety.

Purpose:
This study explored the relationship between patient anxiety levels before and after the procedure and additional communications.

Sample:
Participants undertaking a healthcare science procedure were divided into two groups: Group A (19 patients) only received prior written information, Group B (18 patients) received the same written information and were also given an opportunity to speak to a healthcare scientist prior to the procedure.

Design and methods:
The study purpose and design were approved by the Local Research Ethics Committee. Patients were randomised into the two groups. Patient anxiety was measured using a self-report questionnaire before and after the procedure.

Please go to next page…
Results:
There was no significant difference between anxiety levels prior to the test between the two groups (Group A mean 5.4, Group B mean 4.9). However, the impact on Group B of additional verbal communication led to a more marked decrease in post-procedure anxiety scores (Group A mean 4.5, Group B mean 3.3).

Conclusion:
The study draws two conclusions. The first is that anxiety levels decrease after the procedure for all patients, the second is that additional verbal communication from a healthcare scientist leads to a greater reduction in patient anxiety. We recommend that patient pathways should be revised to include additional verbal healthcare scientist advice.
Abstract Structure:

Abstracts should be structured as follows:

- **Background**: Should indicate the purpose and objective of the research, the hypothesis that was tested or a description of the problem being analysed or evaluated.

- **Methods**: Should describe the setting/location for the study, study design, study population, data collection and methods of analysis used.

- **Results**: Should clearly present in as much as much detail as possible the findings/outcome of the study, with specific results in summarised form. Inclusion of gender breakdown of data is strongly encouraged.

- **Conclusions**: Should briefly discuss the data and main outcome of the study and emphasise the significance of healthcare innovation and the impact on patients.

**Word Limits**

The abstract text body is limited to 350 words.

**Ethical Research Declaration**

Abstracts will only be accepted if the research that has been conducted has been done so in accordance with the protocol approved by the institutional or local committee on ethics.