Instructions for Authors of Renal Week Abstracts

WRITING YOUR ABSTRACT:

Please follow the following format when writing your abstract:

- **Title: encapsulating the main focus of study (in bold)**
- Names and affiliations of authors
    - *N.B. Please do not use affiliations (names, companies, universities, institutions) in the title as abstracts will be reviewed in a blinded manner*
- Indicate the corresponding author[#] and provide their email address
- Introduction: why is this study important, what question does it address?
- Methods: what did you do or what do you plan to do?
- Results: what did you find (include actual data and indication of statistical significance) or if you are presenting a study plan, what are your planned study endpoints and how will they be analysed statistically?
- Conclusions: what can you safely conclude from your study and what questions does this lead on to or if you are presenting a study plan what are the potential issues/pitfalls with your study you would like to discuss?

Please submit as a word document.

Do not use subheadings for the above sections – start a new paragraph with a space between paragraphs.

Do not include references. A single figure or table may be included.

Word limit – 300 words excluding title and affiliations. Please indicate your word count at the bottom of your abstract.

Use **12-point Times New Roman** font throughout.

Please see EXAMPLE ABSTRACT included at the end of this document on Pages 3-4.

STATEMENT OF DISCLOSURE:

All abstracts must include a statement at the bottom of their abstract, headed '**Disclosures'**, on behalf of all co-authors, regarding any disclosures for their work. This enables congress attendees to determine whether or not there may have been bias or the perception of bias. This can occur when any of the authors (or someone related to the authors e.g. family member, spouse, friend) has a relationship with any entity that has a vested interest (direct or indirect) related to the submission.

Examples include:

- Any form of support (financial or otherwise) for the study described in the abstract.
- Any form of support for other work that the authors are involved in.

- Financial relationships (which may be unrelated to the subject matter of the abstract) whereby the individual or relative benefits by receiving a salary, royalties, consulting fees, speaker honoraria, ownership interests (e.g. stock or stock options), or other benefits.
- Indirect benefits i.e. where the author, or author's institution, benefits from the results of the study. An example would be where the author (or their institution) runs a laboratory service, which performs an assay that is discussed in the abstract.

ETHICAL APPROVAL OF STUDY:

ACVNU adheres to AVMA Policy on Veterinary Clinical Studies Committees (2023) and requires all abstracts to have evidence of ethical approval (or reason for exemption) for each study. At the bottom of the abstract you must indicate one of the following categories:

1. Evidence of ethical approval: this should be provided in the form of an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) or Clinical Research and Ethics Review Board (CRERB) reference number/statement and date.
2. This is a future study which is currently being planned for which ethical approval will be obtained if required by my local IACUC/CRERB in the future. Please include the institute name of the approving body.
3. No ethical approval was required or obtained for this study. Please provide the reason why no approval was obtained (e.g. a retrospective study). Failure to provide an appropriate reason may lead to abstract rejection.

ELIGIBILITY FOR RESEARCH PRIZE

If you are an undergraduate or postgraduate trainee, including a master's or PhD student, intern, or resident, please indicate your current training status. This information will allow us to prioritize your abstract submission appropriately and determine your eligibility for the Zoetis-sponsored ACVNU–IRIS Renal Week 2027 Research Award.

EXAMPLE ABSTRACT

ACVNU ABSTRACT SUBMISSION FORM

ABSTRACT TITLE *Effect of control of systolic blood pressure on survival in cats with systemic hypertension*

FIRST AUTHOR NAME *Rosanne E. Jepson*

FIRST AUTHOR INSTITUTION *Royal Veterinary College*

EMAIL ADDRESS *rjepson@rvc.ac.uk*

OTHER AUTHORS AND INSTITUTIONS (Please list all co-authors and their affiliated institutions.)

A.B. Nameless, Royal Veterinary College, C.D. Noname, Royal Veterinary College

ABSTRACT (Maximum 300 words)

Systemic hypertension is a common clinical problem, often occurring in association with renal disease in cats. Limited information is available to assess the effect of blood pressure and the treatment of hypertension on survival.

Hypertensive cats (n=141) were treated with amlodipine besylate and were followed until death or the study end point. Time-averaged systolic blood pressure (SBPOT) after implementation of antihypertensive medication and stabilization of systolic blood pressure (SBP) was calculated by using the equation (area under the curve/survival [days]). Cats were divided into quartiles based on their SBPOT, representing varying levels of blood pressure control (median [25th, 75th percentile]: Q1 = 137 [132, 141] mm Hg, Q2 = 148 [145, 151] mm Hg, Q3 = 157 [155, 158] mm Hg, Q4 = 170 [164, 175] mm Hg). Survival and clinical variables were compared between the quartiles. Cox proportional hazard regression analysis was used to determine the association of age, renal function, proteinuria, SBPOT, and the presence of hyperthyroidism on survival. Urine protein to creatinine ratio (UP:C) was compared at diagnosis of hypertension and after initiating treatment.

Only UP:C and SBP at diagnosis differed significantly between SBPOT quartiles. Proteinuria was the only variable significantly related to survival in hypertensive cats. A significant decline in UP:C was found in cats treated with amlodipine besylate.

Proteinuria before and after treatment of hypertension is strongly associated with survival in cats with systolic hypertension. Treatment with amlodipine besylate can result in a significant reduction in UP: C.

WORD COUNT *243*

ETHICAL APPROVAL (Please state whether ethical approval was required and, if applicable, provide the approving body and reference number.)

☒ Ethical approval was obtained: URN *1234* Institution *Royal Veterinary College* Date *2007*

☐ Future study which is being planned; Ethical approval will be obtained

☐ No ethical approval was required/obtained. Reason: [ ]

DISCLOSURES (Please declare any conflicts of interest, funding sources, or other relevant disclosures for each author. If none, please state "None".)

R Jepson Consulting for Company A and B, Grants from Company C and D, Honorarium from E and F

A.B. Nameless: *None*

C.D. Noname: *Grant funding from company E and F, Position at University of X funded by Company G, Consultancy with Company C and D.*

PREFERENCE FOR POSTER OR ORAL PRESENTATION (Please indicate your first choice preference. Abstracts not included for an oral presentation will automatically be assigned a poster)

☐ Oral

☒ Poster

RESEARCH PRIZE ELIGIBILITY Please indicate whether the first author is eligible for consideration for the ACVNU research prize.

☐ Yes, I am an undergraduate or post-graduate student (intern, resident, Masters, PhD)

☒ No

AUTHOR DECLARATION

I confirm that the information provided in this submission is accurate and that all authors have reviewed and approved the abstract submission.

Name: *Rosanne Jepson*

Date: *1 September 2026*