

HSRPP Conference 2027 Abstract Submission Guidance

The Health Services Research and Pharmacy Practice (HSRPP) conference committee are inviting people to submit abstracts for consideration for presentation at the 2027 HSRPP conference. Guidance on eligibility and the submission process are provided below.

Abstracts related to the conference theme of **'Unlocking Potential: Building Research Capacity in Pharmacy Practice'** are strongly encouraged. This theme is inclusive in nature and should facilitate submission of a variety of research topics; abstracts pertaining to any aspect of health services research relevant to medicines or pharmacy are also welcomed. All accepted abstracts presented at the conference will be published in a Supplement to the International Journal of Pharmacy Practice (IJPP) and will have a citation for future reference.

Abstracts reporting qualitative and quantitative research projects, literature reviews (with robust searching/methodology – e.g. systematic, scoping, realist, etc.), trials, secondary analyses of datasets, mixed methods studies, service evaluations, and audits are welcome. All abstracts must include a description of the introduction, aim, methods, results, and a conclusion as outlined in the abstract judging criteria below. Abstracts that describe research protocols or preliminary work in progress without results are not permitted.

The HSRPP conference committee encourages researchers and practitioners of all levels of experience to submit an abstract for the HSRPP Conference 2027. As well as receiving submissions from experienced researchers, we are particularly keen to encourage those early career researchers, including:

- PhD students, other research students, and junior research staff,
- Practitioners new to research,
- Practitioners who have investigated new innovations or tried out new ways of doing things in practice,
- Practitioners who have evaluated new services.

The use of large language models (LLMs)/generative artificial intelligence in the development of abstracts must be documented in the Methods. LLMs cannot be credited as an author, as authorship requires that the author be accountable for the submitted/published work, and artificial intelligence cannot fulfil this requirement. Authors listed on the abstract must review the content generated by any LLM and take full responsibility for it, as they would for any other content within the abstract.

Submission details

- Please upload your abstract no later than **Thursday 22nd October 2026 at 11.59pm (UK time)** by following the link on the HSRPP website: <https://hsrppconference.org.uk>
- Abstracts will be judged using the [abstract judging criteria](#) shown below. Please review these carefully before uploading your abstract.
- Only abstracts written in English will be considered for acceptance.
- Your abstract will be judged anonymously by the conference committee.
 - When uploading your abstract, you will be asked to provide all author names, affiliations (e.g. in the form of department name, institution name, city, country), and the submitting author's email address, but these details will not be provided to those judging the abstracts.
- Please ensure that the abstract does not contain any identifying details in the body text or reference list (e.g. instead of saying 'Cardiff & Vale NHS Trust', say 'a large NHS trust').
- During the abstract submission process, you will be asked the following questions:
 - Whether your study has received ethical approval or justifying why you believe ethical approval was not required. If you did not believe your study required ethical approval, please enter text explaining this during the submission process: e.g. 'Ethical approval was not required because the study evaluates existing practice and so is considered a service evaluation/audit comparing practice against accepted clinical guidelines. The organisation's research and audit department has confirmed and registered the study as a service evaluation/audit (ref no: XXX)'. This means you do not need to include information on ethical approval in the abstract.

- Whether you prefer to present your research as an oral presentation, poster presentation, or either. The conference committee will make the final decision on mode of presentation following abstract adjudication. Please note that there will be prizes for oral and poster presentation categories.
- Whether you would like to present your study as a rapid-fire presentation if you are awarded a poster presentation; this would consist of a 1-minute oral presentation comprising a maximum of one slide to describe the research that may encourage delegates to view the poster.
- All applicants will be informed of the adjudicating committee's decision by **15th December 2026**. For those abstracts requiring further revision before acceptance, authors will have until Thursday 28th January 2027 to re-submit an abstract with the required revisions.
- In the week commencing **1st March 2027**:
 - Authors of abstracts requiring revision will receive a final decision.
 - All authors of accepted abstracts will be informed whether their abstract has been selected for an oral presentation or poster presentation. If an abstract has been selected as a poster presentation, authors will be informed if their poster has also been selected for a rapid-fire presentation (if authors had requested this).
- At least one author on accepted abstracts must i) register for the conference by **25th March 2027** (as abstracts must be finalised with the IJPP journal for publication) and ii) attend the conference to present the research.
- If you have any queries, please email: hsrpp2027@manchester.ac.uk

Abstract format

Please use all the following headings to format your abstract: Introduction, Aim, Methods, Results, and Conclusion. The overall word count for these sections (including the section headings) must not exceed 500 words, or 350 words with one table (in editable format, not as an image) or one figure (either of which should not be too large; please refer to [previously published abstracts in the IJPP supplement](#) for examples of appropriately sized figures and tables). Text in the title, any table, any figure, and up to two references are not included in the word count. Photographs or similar images are not permitted.

Abstracts should use Arial font size 11, and have the section headings in bold on the same line as the text associated with that heading, e.g. **Introduction:** Medication safety is...

Please read the abstract judging criteria below to ensure you meet the requirements for each section.

References:

Up to two references in the Vancouver referencing style are permitted and should be included under a heading titled 'References' at the end of the abstract. Any reference(s) must be cited in the text and should be denoted using numbers in square brackets and set in superscript after the punctuation, e.g. ...in this study.^[1]

If any reference(s) may identify the study authors, the superscripted citation (e.g. ^[1]) should still be included in the abstract text, with the following in the References section: '*Reference details not provided as may identify authors*'. This is to help maintain anonymity when judging; if the abstract is accepted, the full reference details will be requested and included for publication.

If there are 3 or fewer authors, list all author names. If there are 4 or more authors, then use the first three author names, followed by *et al.* with a period, in italics.

Journal reference example: Malet-Larrea A, Arbillaga L, Gastelurrutia MÁ, *et al.* Defining and characterising age-friendly community pharmacies: a qualitative study. *Int J Pharm Pract* 2018; 27(1): 25-33.

Book reference example: Michie S, Atkins L, West R. *The Behaviour Change Wheel: a guide to designing interventions*. Great Britain: Silverback Publishing, 2014.

Abstract judging criteria

	Component	Criteria
1.	Screening	Does the project contain any 'fatal flaws' which means it should not be accepted (e.g. does not meet eligibility criteria, method not able to address research question, unethical practice)?
2.	Title	Does the title fully represent the study and the method used?
3.	Introduction	Does the introduction provide sufficient background information to describe the study area or phenomenon of interest and justify why this project is needed or is significant?
4.	Aim	Is/are the aim(s) clear?
5.	Methods	a) Is the project design clear and appropriate to the aim(s)? b) Is the data collection process appropriate to the aim and clear, e.g. relating to recruitment, sampling, or other procedures (or for reviews: relating to eligibility criteria, information sources, study selection)? c) Are the data analysis/synthesis procedures appropriate and clear?
6.	Results	a) Do the main findings address the aim(s)? b) Are the main findings clearly described and supported with evidence? (For reviews, this may include providing details on study characteristics and main outcomes).
7.	Conclusion	a) Does the conclusion address the study aim(s)? b) Are the study's broader implications for practice/research/policy discussed? c) Does this address at least one study strength and at least one study limitation?

Consider using a reporting checklist to guide the content of your abstract, if available for the type of research conducted. See <https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/>.

Factors including abstract quality/coherence (e.g. study robustness, clarity, logical flow), study originality and/or innovativeness (the extent to which the study presents new or innovative ideas, methods, findings or applications), potential impact (the potential of the study to improve patient care or advance research, practice, or policy), and alignment with conference theme(s) will also be considered by the conference committee when choosing oral/poster presentations.