

EAHP - EPSA Student Science Award

Guidelines for writing an abstract

The EAHP - EPSA Student Science Award is aimed at pharmacy and pharmaceutical sciences students and young professionals who have graduated within the last two years. It provides applicants who are studying or have studied in countries represented by EAHP and/or EPSA with an opportunity to present original research carried out in the areas of hospital or clinical pharmacy and thus recognises students' efforts to contribute to the development of hospital pharmacy. To apply for the award, you will need to submit an abstract of your research together with a completed student involvement form and proof of your student status to intern@eahp.eu.

The submissions will be reviewed by a jury comprised out of members of EAHP's Scientific Committee. Out of all the submissions, the best abstract will be chosen. The author of the best abstract will be announced at EAHP's Annual Congress.

There are certain criteria on how the abstracts should be structured. When reviewing the abstracts, the jury will rate them based on these criteria strictly, so the closer you follow them the higher the chance that your abstract will be selected for the next round and eventually win the reward.

What is an abstract?

An abstract is a summary of the essential points of your research. It should be concise, understandable, easy to read, and it should adhere to the requested structure.¹ The abstract should be no longer than 300 words. In those 300 words, you will need to summarize the problem you are tackling in your research, explain how the research was performed, stress out the most relevant and important results, and present the principal conclusions.

The abstract should be split into the following sub-headers: **Background and Objectives**, **Methods**, **Results**, **Conclusions**.

Background and Objectives: In the beginning, feel free to include some **background** of your study. You should be aware of what was done previously with regards to your research and you may list that here. Ask yourself **why** did you perform your research and show the readers that your message is new. The **Objectives** should introduce your research paper to the reader and grab their attention. Focus on why your research is important and put it in context – ask yourself **what was the outcome of the study**. Feel free to add a clear question which you tackled in the research, so the reader knows exactly what you wanted to achieve.

Methods: This part should focus on **how** your research was performed. You should mention the methods you used to gather data for your research together with a brief description of the crucial details of the methods. The methods should be clear and valid.

¹ The structure of your abstract depends on the publication you are submitting it for. This guideline is focused on [EJHP requirements](#)

Results: This is the key section of the abstract. In this part, you should focus on **what you found**. Strive to provide as many results as you can. Do not provide only percentages, but also numbers. Instead of stating 75%, state 75 (75/100). Also, when providing results with decimal numbers, keep in mind that percentages should be presented as whole numbers (e.g. 36.666 should be given as 37). Make sure to provide the results of measurements of height, weight, length and volume in metric units or their decimal multiples, the temperature in degrees Celsius, blood pressure in millimetres of Mercury (mmHg), haematological and clinical chemistry measurements should be given in the metric system in terms of the International System of Units (SI).

Conclusion: In this part, you should focus on drawing a conclusion from the results you obtained, relating to your objective. Do not be too general with the conclusion, but make sure you address all aims of your research. At the same time, be careful not to be overconfident with the conclusions – make sure they are realistic. Conclusions **should not** contain your personal opinions. Limit yourself to drawing conclusions based purely on the results of your research and relate them to your objective, depending on the type of research and generated hypothesis (controlled study; observational study). Do not include new information in the conclusion.

When you finish the conclusion, aim to summarize everything in at least five **keywords**. Write them out below the conclusion, make sure they are relevant and that the reader can recognize crucial points of the research from them.

What defines a good abstract?

A good abstract is based on a good and clear study. An abstract should be written after the study is carried out, for you to be able to summarize the study well. The general pointers listed below provide will provide you with a clearer understanding what constitutes a good abstract.

- The title of your abstract should reflect what your research was about. The reader will set their expectations based on the title, so guide them to set the right ones with a specific and well thought-out title.
- Make sure you use plain English whenever possible, to ease the reading and understanding of the abstract. The text should flow smoothly. Make sure you present the key points of your study clearly in the objective, so that you will have something to build your abstract on. Guide the reader from your objectives to your conclusions fluently. The easiest way to ensure this is to make sure that the title, objectives, and conclusions are linked.
- After you are done with writing the abstract, make sure to re-read it a couple of times to eliminate the spelling and grammar mistakes. There is a lot of software available to help you with that. Also, if you are don't feel confident in using English, or simply want someone to double-check what you wrote, ask a fellow student or one of your teachers to go through the abstract and help.
- Using abbreviations is allowed, but make sure you define them clearly when using them for the first time in the abstract. Do not use uncommon abbreviations in your title.
- Do not mention too many references.

How is your abstract evaluated?

Upon submission, your article will be delivered to the EAHP-EPSA Student Science Award jury who will check its compliance with the following criteria:

- Relevance of paper to hospital pharmacy
- Scientific quality
- Language/ composition and structure
- Student involvement

Relevance of the paper to Hospital Pharmacy: Your paper needs to be relevant to hospital pharmacy or related disciplines of specific relevance to hospital pharmacy. Look for connections in your research that aim at improving the knowledge and practice of hospital pharmacists.

Scientific Quality: Your abstract should transmit the quality of your research. The research itself should be planned and executed well. It should contribute something original to the field of hospital pharmacy. Make sure to use scientific methods to answer your research question, the background and importance of which should be considered.

Language, composition and structure: Make sure the language you are using in both abstract and research is clear and easy to understand. There are many tools available for you to ensure the spelling and grammar used in your abstract is correct. If you are not comfortable with your English skills, ask a fellow student to review your first draft. The abstract should follow the structure mentioned above, and the reader should be able to read it as one unit, not several sections presented one after the other.

Student involvement: You should be the main contributor to the scientific work and the main author of the abstract.

You should keep in mind that the EJHP is looking for three things in both research and the abstract: **quality, originality, and contribution to hospital pharmacy**. Make sure you present the quality of your research through your abstract well and clearly show what your research contributes to both hospital pharmacy and science in general.

Good luck with writing your abstract!ⁱ

i The information contained in this document has been summarized from the EJHP Guidelines for authors, the Editorial "If only abstracts were more concrete!" by Prof Phil Wiffen, a [podcast](#) "The art of writing an abstract" by Lene Juel Kjeldsen, Torsten Hoppe-Trichy, and Gunar Stemer, and the [webcast](#) of the workshop "How to write an abstract" from the 18th EAHP Congress 2013, Paris, France, by Lene Juel Kjeldsen, Torsten Hoppe-Trichy, and Gunar Stemer.