

## EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR BEST CLINICAL CASE COMPETITION

61<sup>st</sup> SEFH Congress, 2016

The items to be evaluated are as follows:

### 1. INTRODUCTION (10 points)

- a. The case's interest is adequately justified.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 2. INSUFFICIENT 5. ADEQUATE
- b. The originality of the case is clearly expressed.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 2. INSUFFICIENT 5. ADEQUATE

### 2. CASE REPORT (25 points)

- a. The clinical presentation is clear and well-organized.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 1.5. INSUFFICIENT 3. GOOD 5. EXCELLENT
- b. The clinical, analytical, radiographic data, etc. provided are sufficient and appropriate to understanding the case.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 1.5. INSUFFICIENT 3. ACCEPTABLE 5. EXCELLENT
- c. The pharmacotherapeutic treatment (drugs, nutrition (if pertinent), dosage, type of administration, treatment duration, etc.) is presented with sufficient detail, clear, and well-organized.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 1.5. INSUFFICIENT 3. GOOD 5. EXCELLENT
- d. The pharmacist's intervention in the case is expressed in detail.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 1.5. INSUFFICIENT 3. GOOD 5. EXCELLENT
- e. The consequences that each pharmaceutical intervention had on the resolution of the case are reported.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 1.5. INSUFFICIENT 3. GOOD 5. EXCELLENT

### 3. DISCUSSION & PHARMACY CONTRIBUTION (25 points)

- a. The drug-related problems that arose are reported.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 1.5. INSUFFICIENT 3. GOOD 5. EXCELLENT
- b. Each of the pharmaceutical interventions related to the drug problems that arose are discussed adequately and sufficiently.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 2. INSUFFICIENT 5. GOOD 7.5. EXCELLENT
- c. The need and importance of the pharmaceutical intervention is justified.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 2. INSUFFICIENT 5. GOOD 7.5. EXCELLENT
- d. The pharmacist has worked as part of a multidisciplinary team collaborating to resolve the case.  
0. NO 0. DON'T KNOW/ DOESN'T ANSWER 5. YES

### 4. BIBLIOGRAPHY (5 points)

- a. The bibliography provided is up-to-date and high quality and is relevant enough to support this case report.  
0. DOES NOT COMPLY 2. INSUFFICIENT 5. ADEQUATE

### 5. ORIGINALITY & RELEVANCE OF THE CASE (25 points)

- a. Provides a degree of INNOVATION in the approach to a problem or to how to resolve it (For instance, new techniques to determine drug levels, clinically relevant adverse events not previously reported, application of new technologies, multidisciplinary team-building, incorporation of pharmacogenetics, new forms of pharmaceutical care, etc.)

0. DOES NOT COMPLY 15. COMPLIES

b. The pharmacist's contribution to the resolution of the case was RELEVANT.

0. Contribution was adequate, but not relevant (it contributed little) in the resolution.

6. Contribution was adequate and contributed to a certain degree to the resolution of the case.

10. Contribution was adequate and was decisive to the resolution of the case.

**6. PRESENTATION & STYLE (10 points)**

a. The title is appropriate and reflects the content of the work.

0. DOES NOT COMPLY 2. COMPLIES

b. The style, composition, and grammar is adequate.

0. DOES NOT COMPLY 2.5. GOOD 4. EXCELLENT

c. The presentation and understanding of the case is facilitated by the presence of the necessary tables, graphs, and images.

0. DOES NOT COMPLY 2.5. GOOD 4. EXCELLENT