

ANNUAL ASSEMBLY

HOSPICE & PALLIATIVE CARE

Learn more at
AnnualAssemblyHAPC.org



Call for Reviewers for *Principal Call for Abstracts on Emerging Scientific and Clinical Advances in the Field of Hospice and Palliative Care*

The call for abstract peer reviewers is open July 15 – August 12, 2024, through 12:00 MN PT.

Thank you for volunteering to serve as a peer reviewer for our Assembly abstract submissions. This is a critical component in building a successful conference and your contributions are highly valued.

AAHPM or HPNA membership is required to be eligible to review abstracts. As a potential reviewer, we ask that you complete a conflict-of-interest disclosure form to ensure educational content is fair and balanced, and any clinical content presented supports safe, effective patient care.

- You can choose which category of abstracts you would like to review based on your background, knowledge and expertise of the subject categories.
- You will be provided with portal access to the abstracts for review and scoring criteria with definitions and instructions.
- For abstracts scored at (1) strongly disagree or (5) strongly agree, reviewers are asked to share scoring rationale. This rationale is important to provide supportive/constructive/retrievable feedback that will assist the planning committee with the abstract selection process and allow staff to respond to authors seeking to improve future submissions. Scoring comments will be de-identified when shared as feedback.
- Reviewers are asked to spread scores using the full scoring range of 1-5 with mean of ~3-4 across your abstracts reviewed to mitigate potential tiebreaking measures in our final analysis.
- Reviewer desired outcome for a 3-person review process across all submitted abstracts.

As an accepted abstract reviewer for the Principal Call for Abstracts on Emerging Scientific and Clinical Advances in the Field of Hospice and Palliative Care, please plan to be available **August 19th – September 9th, 2024**, to conduct the abstract review process through the online abstract collection portal.

- The online abstract review process typically involves the review of 10-15 abstracts per person depending on the number of reviewers available.
- The total time takes ~15 minutes per review.

Reviewers are recognized as contributors to the Annual Assembly planning team and are listed on the Annual Assembly site for their contributions in selecting quality content to include in the Assembly Accredited Continuing Education offerings. Thank you for considering this opportunity to participate in the Annual Assembly planning process as an abstract reviewer.

ANNUAL ASSEMBLY

HOSPICE & PALLIATIVE CARE

Learn more at
AnnualAssemblyHAPC.org



Abstract Review Process

Annual Assembly abstracts are managed under a double-blinded, peer review process. Both the reviewer's and abstract author's identities are blinded from each other throughout the review process. Authors declaring risk of bias or other conflict of interest in reviewing an abstract submission can opt out of submission review and reassigned an alternative submission.

Abstract Review Guidelines

Accepted content is aimed to advance research, clinical best practices, and practice-related guidance in the delivery of quality serious illness care to include:

- A. balanced and evidence-based, evaluated to guide safe, effective care.
- B. designed for relevance to practice based on unique learner identified needs and knowledge of practice gaps.

The following points are to be taken into consideration when scoring abstracts:

1. **State of Completion:** For the principal call, the abstract must show substantial results indicating that the work has been completed.
2. **Novelty:** The abstract shows innovative information or presents a new topic or application in the field of palliative and/or hospice care.
3. **Advancement of field:** The abstract presents a significant contribution to the field of palliative and/or hospice care, and the authors specify how the paper will contribute to learners' knowledge, skills, and/or strategies to increase competency, influence behaviors, and/or improve patient outcomes in hospice and palliative care.
4. **Scientific research:** All abstract content referred to, reported, or used in support or justification of a patient care recommendation conforms to the generally accepted standards of experimental design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation.
5. **Quality:** The abstract's quality is to be considered indicative of the final presentation by the reviewers and planning committee. The abstract submission adheres to the submission guideline requirements outlined in the submission process (e.g., titling format, deidentified, DEI content inclusion where relevant, etc.).
6. **Relevance:** Material presented in abstract submission is concise and coherent, with the focus of the abstract and its relevance to a palliative and/or hospice audience stated clearly. The background of the issue(s) and the presentation objectives are clearly defined.

Abstract Scoring Rubrics: Max score of 50 using Likert scale of 1-5 strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

Accredited Education Content Validity:

1. Abstract is fair and balanced and is based on evidence that is accepted within the specialty as adequate justification of recommendations.
2. All scientific research referred to, reported, or used in support or justification of a recommendation conforms to the generally accepted standards of experimental design, data collection and analysis.
3. Abstract meets the definition of accredited continuing education and serves to maintain, develop, or increase the knowledge, skills, and/or professional performance and relationships used to provide services for patients, the public, or the palliative and/or hospice profession.

Advancement of field:

1. The abstract presents a significant contribution to the field of palliative and/or hospice care, and the authors must specify how the paper will contribute to the development of practice knowledge.

ANNUAL ASSEMBLY

HOSPICE & PALLIATIVE CARE

Learn more at
AnnualAssemblyHAPC.org



2. All scientific research related to the submission conforms to the generally accepted standards of design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation.
3. The quality of an abstract will be considered indicative of the quality of the final presentation by the reviewers and planning committee. Authors should use care, assuring that the reviewer will discern the background information and adherence to the submission guideline requirements.
4. Material presented in the abstract submissions must be concise and coherent, with the focus to enhance the learners' knowledge, skills, strategies to increase competency, influence behaviors, and/or improve patient outcomes in hospice and palliative care.

Abstract Paradigm Shifting Impact Potential:

1. Abstract is of highest quality of importance and interest in the field and should be presented; likely to have high impact on future palliative and/or hospice research/practice.
2. Abstract addresses cultural humility and sensitivity in case examples and where applicable, describes how issues of cultural diversity, equity, and inclusion are considered in specific aims or narrative of proposed content to include impact of proposed topic or research on underrepresented and underserved populations.
3. Abstract features an innovative/cutting-edge approach or discusses emerging research that could inform and improve patient care or features common practices in a new way.

Abstract Content:

1. Abstract is well written and clearly communicated, organized, includes references, and generative AI and AI-assistive technology disclosures and adheres to the submission guideline requirements outlined in the submission process (e.g., titling format, deidentified, DEI content inclusion where relevant, etc.).
2. Given the topic, the abstract has appropriate and critical IDT representation.
3. Author identified target audience experience level aligns with abstract content.
4. Recommendations for patient care are based on current science, evidence, and clinical reasoning, while giving a fair and balanced view of diagnostic and therapeutic options.

Additional Review Scoring Criteria for Quality Improvement/Scientific/Research abstract and poster submissions:

*Reviewer Note: Results **are required** for Principal Call abstract and poster QI/Scientific/Research submissions to be accepted.

1. Content includes scientifically justified recommendations and supports the conclusion.
2. The study question and/or hypothesis is clearly and succinctly stated.
3. The sample is appropriate for the study questions and methodology.
4. The analysis is sound, appropriate, and sufficiently described.
5. Research design and methodology are rigorous and appropriate for the study question.
6. Results reflect the described approach appropriate for the research question and support the conclusion.

Note: Review criteria may be revised based on planning committee recommendations.