# **Health Services Research and Pharmacy Practice Conference 2023**

# **Abstract Judging Criteria**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Quantitative and qualitative studies** | **Systematic reviews** |
|  | **Screening** | Does the research contain any ‘fatal flaws’ which means it should not be accepted (e.g. method not able to address research question, unethical practice)?  If yes, do not score further and provide a qualitative response to the authors. This will reviewed by the HSRPP committee.  If no, continue with scoring. | |
|  | **Title**  Yes = 1  No = 0 | Does the title fully represent the study and the method used? | The title should fully represent the study. Should identify the research as a systematic review, meta-analysis or both. |
|  | **Introduction**  Yes = 1  No = 0 | Is the phenomenon and its significance clearly described? | The introduction should justify why research in this area is needed and why it is worthwhile. For a full systematic review, does the review identify its PROSPERO registration number? Non-systematic reviews (e.g. rapid reviews, scoping reviews) require strong justification for not using full systematic review methodology. |
|  | **Aims / objectives**  Yes = 1  No = 0 | Are the aims clear? | Do the objectives reflect what the review intended to evaluate/compare in terms of outcome (benefit/harm) in the context or population being studied? |
|  | **Research Design & Methodology**  Apply to each sub-question  Yes = 2  Partly = 1  No = 0 | 1. Is the design appropriate and clear? 2. Is the data collection process appropriate and clear (including recruitment, sampling and data collection procedures)? 3. Are the data analysis procedures appropriate and clear? | 1. Is the design appropriate and clear? 2. Is the data collection process appropriate and clear (eligibility criteria e.g use of PI(E)COS, information sources, study selection, risk of bias/quality assessment)? 3. Are the data synthesis procedures appropriate and clear? |
|  | **Results**  Yes = 2  Partly = 1  No = 0 | Are the main findings clearly described and supported with evidence? | A description of the results, including relevant characteristics of studies and main outcomes. |
|  | **Conclusion / discussion**  Apply to each sub-question  Yes = 2  Partly = 1  No = 0 | 1. Are the study’s broader implications for practice, research and/ or policy discussed? 2. Are the study’s strengths and limitations discussed? | 1. The discussion should discuss the implications for practice, research and /or policy. 2. Should summarise strengths and limitations of evidence (e.g. inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness, or risk of bias, other supporting or conflicting evidence). |

**Max score = 15**

The systematic review criteria have been adapted from the [Equator network](https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/prisma-abstracts/):

Beller EM, Glasziou PP, Altman DG, et al. PRISMA for Abstracts: reporting systematic reviews in journal and conference abstracts. PLoS Med 2013;10(4):e1001419. [doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001419](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001419" \t "_blank).