

**Rural Healthcare: A Meta-Analysis on Green Tea Extract (GTE) Effect on Markers of Insulin Resistance**

Marcelle Savoy PhD<sup>2</sup>, Lori McGrew PhD<sup>3</sup>, Lauren Wisnieski MS PhD<sup>4</sup>, Karen Szynski DVM MPH PhD DACVPM<sup>4</sup>, Mary Beth Babos MS PharmD BCPS<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>DeBusk College of Osteopathic Medicine at Lincoln Memorial University-Knoxville, Knoxville, TN, USA  
<sup>2</sup>Reed Health Sciences Library, Lincoln Memorial University-DeBusk College of Osteopathic Medicine, Knoxville, TN, USA  
<sup>3</sup>Dept of Pharmacology, Lincoln Memorial University-DeBusk College of Osteopathic Medicine, Harrogate, TN, USA  
<sup>4</sup>Center for Animal and Human Health in Appalachia, Lincoln Memorial University College of Veterinary Medicine, Harrogate, TN, USA

**ACADEMIC POSTER CONTEST**

Advancing Rural Research

**Fig. 3 Risk of bias assessment summary**

- Three authors independently used the Cochrane tool for assessing risk of bias in the RCTs used in this study<sup>3</sup> (Fig. 3).
- Statistical analyses were performed using the REVMAN 5 software<sup>6</sup>.

Item	Low risk of bias	Unclear risk of bias	High risk of bias
Sequence generation (selection bias)	100%	0%	0%
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	100%	0%	0%
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	100%	0%	0%
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	100%	0%	0%
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	100%	0%	0%
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	100%	0%	0%
Other bias	100%	0%	0%

**Fig. 4 Forest plot on % change in plasma insulin level**  
(mean effect size = -14.06%, 95% CI = -37.49%, +9.38%, p=0.24)

Study	Mean % Change	95% CI	Total	Mean % Change	95% CI
Nguyen 2011	-15.1	[-21.3, -8.9]	28	-15.1	[-21.3, -8.9]
Shah 2014	-4.3	[-12.1, 3.5]	208	-4.3	[-12.1, 3.5]
Shah 2017	3.9	[-1.8, 9.6]	147	3.9	[-1.8, 9.6]
Nguyen 2017	-13.9	[-21.7, -6.1]	47	-13.9	[-21.7, -6.1]
Nguyen 2012	0	[-5.1, 5.1]	58	0	[-5.1, 5.1]
Nguyen 2010	0.95	[-4.8, 6.7]	452	0.95	[-4.8, 6.7]
Shah 2016, 2015	-5.0	[-11.1, 1.1]	88	-5.0	[-11.1, 1.1]
<b>Total (95% CI)</b>	<b>-14.06</b>	<b>[-37.49, +9.38]</b>	<b>1166</b>	<b>-14.06</b>	<b>[-37.49, +9.38]</b>

**Fig. 7 Funnel plot on % change in HOMA-IR index**

**Discussion**

7 studies were included in the meta-analysis. GT/GTE consumption for over 4 weeks resulted in a statistically significant percentage reduction in HOMA-IR index and non-statistically significant percentage reduction in plasma insulin levels (Fig. 4 and 6).

RURAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF TENNESSEE

10th Annual Student, Resident, and Faculty Virtual Poster Competition Information  
 November 20-22, 2024

# Rural Health Association of Tennessee

## 10th Annual Student, Resident, and Faculty Virtual Poster Competition Information

This virtual research poster competition is a low-cost way for students, residents, and faculty to share their research without the costs of producing a “hard-copy” poster.

Division winners and the overall winner will receive a gift certificate or modest cash award (check).

**Submission Deadline: Friday, October 18, 2024 (No late entrants will be accepted).**

Announcements of the winners will be on Thursday, November 21, 2024, at RHA's 30th Annual Conference luncheon. You do not have to be present to win.

### Evaluation and Judging

Submissions to the Virtual Poster Competition will be evaluated in two areas:

- Scientific Content (75%)
  - Introduction & background with pertinent literature cited (15 points)
  - Objectives clearly stated & concise (15 points)
  - Materials & methods (study design) clear & concise (15 points)
  - Results & discussion clear, concise & accurate (15 points)
  - Significance of results to field of study (15 points)
- Virtual Poster Display (25%)
  - Organization
    - Logical order, minimum redundancy (5 points)
    - Effective use of space; smooth transitions (5 points)
  - Text, Figures, and Tables
    - Legible with large fonts, color contrast, no conflicting backgrounds (5 points)
    - Text with no grammatical errors; not excessively wordy (5 points)
    - Effective use of figures and/or tables, coordinated with text (5 points)

Numerical scores are proportioned accordingly. Each poster display is judged independently by three judges. Top candidates may be contacted to respond to questions by one or more judges.

In the event of a tie, the Competition Co-Chairs will use the submitted abstract as a tie-breaker. Abstracts will be judged according to how informative and well written it is and how well it correlates with the presentation.

A sample Virtual Poster Competition Scorecard is available for reference.

### Divisions

The following four divisions will be judged separately from one another:

1. Undergraduate and Masters' Students
2. Doctoral and Professional Students (MD, DO, PA, NP, DMS, PhD, etc.)
3. Postdoctoral Trainees (Medical Residents, Fellows, etc.)
4. Faculty

## Suggestions for Posters

Each poster must be created in Microsoft PowerPoint or PDF. A template is attached.

Poster design can significantly enhance or severely diminish the effectiveness of your presentation. The following guidelines are general considerations:

- Focus of attention: The focus of attention must be on the subject content. If the design overshadows the subject matter, the message is likely to be lost.
- Size and selection of visuals: Larger visuals attract more attention. Visuals not relevant to the content will distract the viewer.
- Density of visuals and text (labels): Too many visuals (pictures) and text (labels) in a small space decreases readers' attention, because each object is in competition with the others. Minimize these to prevent stimulus overload! Generally, a maximum length of 50-75 words per label results in a higher probability of people reading it.
- Ability to read text: Letters should be large so that they can easily be read from 2-3 feet away. Letters should be easily read (avoid Old English and other "fancy" fonts).
- Poster layout:
  - Use a consistent layout with heading and subheading font and size standardized;
  - Use bulleted lists to facilitate reading;
  - Relate the content of the text to the picture it describes;
  - Reduce competing stimuli—Avoid placing a large number of labels and visuals next to one another; and
  - Provide good contrast between the text and background (avoid white on white, blue on navy, etc.).

Apply at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2024PosterContest>

**TENNESSEE RURAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION Virtual Poster Presentation Evaluation**

Division: (1)Undergrad/Masters (2)Doctoral/Professional (3)Post Doc/GME (4)Faculty

Judge: \_\_\_\_\_

		Points	Poster#																	
Scientific Content (75%)	Content	15	Introduction & background w/ pertinent literature cited																	
		15	Objectives clearly stated & concise																	
		15	Materials & methods (study design) clear & concise																	
		15	Results & discussion clear, concise, and accurate																	
		15	Significance of results to field of study																	
Poster Display 25%	Organization	5	Logical order, minimum redundancy																	
		5	Effective use of space; smooth transitions between sections																	
	Text, figures, Tables	5	Legible w/ large fonts, color contrast, no conflicting backgrounds																	
		5	Text w/ no grammatical errors; not excessively wordy																	
		5	Effective use of figures and/or tables, coordinated w/ text																	

E = Excellent, VG = Very good, G = Good, F = Fair, NI = Needs improvement  
 10 pts: E=9-10, VG=7-8, G=5-6, F=3-4, and NI=2-1

