## Promotional material by NT Health Library Services for Library and Information Week 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Where advertised:</th>
<th>Example:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where’s the source video (and competition QR code)</td>
<td>• Library televisions (3 locations) &lt;br&gt;• Corporate Health building television (1 location) &lt;br&gt;• Library website homepage &lt;br&gt;• Library monthly eNewsletter (via email to all NT Health employees)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Watch the video" /> &lt;br&gt;Where’s the SOURCE? &lt;br&gt;Library &amp; Information Week 31 July - 6 August 2023 &lt;br&gt;(Video in online supplementary files)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 critical appraisal (and competition QR code) poster</td>
<td>• Library walls (3 locations) &lt;br&gt;• Toilet stall doors near library (1 location) &lt;br&gt;• Various wards and staff tearooms (3 hospitals)</td>
<td>Included as Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Appraisal competition</td>
<td>LibWizard Quiz <a href="https://nt-health.libwizard.com/f/LibInfoWk23">https://nt-health.libwizard.com/f/LibInfoWk23</a> &lt;br&gt;QR code available through: &lt;br&gt;• Video (online) &lt;br&gt;• Poster (physical spaces)</td>
<td>Included as Appendix B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key take-aways:
- A client had good feedback saying they loved the poster and wanted the designer to assist them with their presentation files for an upcoming presentation.
- Quite a few people stopped to watch the video on the tvs as well. Video was well received.
- Common issue we found was staff thought the event was for the public (were confused when we asked to go to tearooms even after explaining).
- We received 8 responses to the Quiz, though it was only active for the work week.
Appendix A

Where’s the **SOURCE?**

**Library & Information Week 31 July – 6 August 2023**

**A SOURCE IS A FORM OF TRUTH TELLING.**
It can invigorate, enlighten and pique our curiosity at the same time that it can activate our scepticism.

Check the validity of a source with the critical appraisal tool CRAAP!

**CURRENCY**
- Was it written recent enough to be accurate?
- Has it been revised or updated?
- Do the links work?

**RELEVANCY**
- Does the information relate to your topic or answer your question?
- Who is the intended audience
- Have you checked other sources

**AUTHORITATIVE**
- Who wrote, published, or publicised it?
- What makes the author an expert?
- Are they backed by an institution? or are they a primary source?

**ACCURATE**
- Is there supporting evidence?
- Has the information been reviewed by factcheckers?
- Are there spelling or grammatical errors?
- What are other experts saying about the source?

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:
- Where does a piece of information come from?
- Why does it appear in the way that it does?
- Who made it?
- Who owns it?
- When was it created?
- Who paid for it?

**PURPOSE**
- Why was this information created?
- Is the purpose clear?
- What biases can you find?
- What is your purpose and bias?

**SCAN THE QR CODE TO ENTER INTRO OUR COMPETITION!**
Appendix B

Library Information Week 2023 - Where's The Source Quiz

Participate in the Health Library Services Quiz!
Answer all 5 questions correctly to go in the draw for a prize.

View the supporting informational video here.
Valid entries into the quiz will close off on the 13/06/2023.

1. Read the abstract, view the source then select the article you think passes the CRAAP test
   Click on the article titles to view the abstracts.

   - Article 1: 5G Technology and induction of Coronavirus in Skin Cells

   ☐ Article 1  ☐ Article 2

2. Which sources would you trust to find the most recent and reliable published literature.
   Click the images that apply.

   ![The Onion](image1)  ![ChatGPT](image2)  ![Science Direct](image3)  ![PubMed](image4)

3. Has bias between the researchers and the purpose of the study been disclosed in the following examples.
   See below snapshots and select one option for each article.

   Article 1:
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Needs more analysis

   Article 2:
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Needs more analysis
Article 1: Declared conflict

Many participants in our trial had previous coronary disease and diabetes and thus are not fully representative of the broad population of patients with hypertension. Furthermore, the diuretic-based combination may not have been the optimal treatment for patients with diabetes. However, the ALLHAT study showed that diuretic-based therapy had the same relative benefit in patients with diabetes as in patients without diabetes.20 These limitations temper the conclusions of the ACCOMPLISH trial.

Our trial shows that combination therapy with benazepril and amlopidine results not only in excellent blood-pressure control but also in a clear benefit with respect to cardiovascular events. Thus, our findings may increase the options for combination treatment to reduce the risk of cardiovascular events among patients with hypertension.

Supported by Novartis. Li, L. (unpublished) reports receiving consulting fees from Novartis, Merck, and Eli Lilly & Co. Satish, S., Glasser, L., and Marc, J., and research support from Novartis and Pfizer, Inc. Weber.

N. INGL. MED 359:233.2012. The New England Journal of Medicine. Downloaded from nejm.org on July 19, 2013. For personal use only. No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2008 Massachusetts Medical Society. All rights reserved.

Article 2: No conflict

2011. In the UK, the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine was approved for commercialization by the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency on December 20, 2020.21 The vaccine received a EMA by the FDA on December 22, 2020.20 The Moderna vaccine was the second vaccine candidate to receive a EMA from the FDA on December 12, 2020,21 and by the EMA on January 15, 2021.24 The University of Oxford/AstraZeneca vaccine received a EMA on January 29, 2021, by the EMA, with some limitations.22 The three companies have predicted the production of billions of vaccines during 2021. Therefore, with this in mind, it is fundamental that these effective vaccines be delivered and administered globally to achieve global herd immunity.
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17. Forie H, Clarke IM, Candido D. Genetic characterization of an emergent SAR-CoV-2 lineage in Manaus, preliminary
4. If multiple studies on a topic have conflicting findings, which one can be relied upon most?
Select one option.

- The article that has been critically appraised and is found reliable
- The article published most recently
- The article published first (oldest article)
- The article published open access

---

5. Choose the most appropriate information sources to inform a clinical guideline.
Click the images that apply.

- NICE Guideline
- Systematic Review
- Website (non government organisation)
- Wikipedia

---

To enter the NT Health Library Services competition, please provide your first name and email 😊