C19
2023

REVIEWER GUIDELINES

REVIEW DEADLINE: MIDNIGHT, 11:59 PM AEDT MONDAY 27 MARCH 2023

PLEASE REVIEW EACH ABSTRACT ACCORDING TO THE SCORING SYSTEM INDICATED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES. **Scoring and Comments are required for all reviews.**

EXPERTISE
We have attempted to match the submissions to your broad area of expertise. There may be some papers that have been allocated to you to review that sit outside this due to a lack of reviewers for a particular theme area. Please do not decline to review an abstract simply because you are not an expert. If there is an issue with a paper assigned to you, please notify the Conference Secretariat.

CONFLICT
We have tried to send you abstracts that do not present you with a conflict of interest based on the stated authors on each abstract. However, there may be some potential conflicts that we have overlooked and may make it difficult for you to review objectively. Examples of conflicts include:
- You have worked on this project
- An author is someone you work with directly
- If you are listed on a grant with the author in the last three years
- Relatives, close friends or sex partners
- Any person whose interests it may be inferred that you have an interest in promoting

Note: due to the small nature of the sector, mere knowledge of the person or project does not give rise to a conflict. If you deem there is a conflict, **please let us know immediately** to re-assign the abstract.

CONFIDENTIALITY
As a reviewer, you have agreed to keep the content of your abstracts confidential. This means that you may not share, reproduce, nor cite the abstract submission in any way until the authors have published the content.

TYPES OF SUBMISSIONS
Submissions have come in both the standard research-based option plus practice-based works. We encourage reviewers to be open-minded about this format and to recognise the different criteria for Research and Practice-based abstracts. In particular, the practice-based abstracts may be about pieces of work that have not concluded (as they are ongoing), and where the purpose of the abstract is to describe a process of identifying a need and/or the application of research or epidemiological data to address an issue playing out in a community. Some flexibility in the review of these conference abstracts will facilitate greater diversity in the program's content. Please ensure you use the correct review criteria for each abstract.
Theme Committees will be encouraged to review the spread of scores attributed to Research and Practice-based to achieve a balance.

Thank you for your time and effort to review to help make the 2nd Australasian COVID-19 Conference 2022 a success. Please contact conference@ashm.org.au or 02 8204 0770 if you have any questions about reviewing.

ashm
conference & events

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES:

OPTION ONE: *RESEARCH-BASED*

This option is used for scientific/research studies. The Abstract Guidelines asked for:

- **Background:** study objectives, hypotheses tested, research questions or description of problem
- **Methods:** methods used or approach taken (e.g. study population, data collection methods, statistical analyses and/or theoretical approach)
- **Results:** in summarised form, must include data (e.g. statistics or qualitative data) but do not include tables, graphs or pictures. include results/outcomes and results of statistical tests such as p values, odds or hazard ratios and confidence intervals.
- **Conclusion:** describe the main outcomes and implications of the study. Highlight the novelty of findings, how they contribute to evidence-based practice and what steps are being taken to put the research into practice.

Research Abstracts should be favoured that incorporate:
- Completed rather than future work
- Original data of high quality
- An analysis that extends existing knowledge
- Clarity of methodology, analysis and presentation of results
- Specific rather than general findings

OPTION TWO: PRACTICE-BASED

The second option is most suited to critical reflections on and evaluations of health care, community mobilisation, peer education and policy, with a view to improving policy and practice. The Abstract Guidelines for this type asked for:

- **Background/Purpose:** describe the problem and outline the project or policy aims
- **Approach:** outline the main components of the project or policy
- **Outcomes/Impact:** Include concrete observations and findings of the social community or political impact of your work based on completed or ongoing work
- **Innovation and significance:** Explain why your project or policy is unique and of significance, including why this project or policy is an important response to current HIV-related health priorities

Note: Practice-based submissions may also adopt the Background/Methods/Results/Conclusions format abstract, in which case they may be reviewed using the criteria for a Research-based submission.

Practice-Based Abstracts should be favoured at review if they incorporate:
- A project or policy change that is new, innovative and/or of high impact
- A project that has been successfully implemented (either completed or ongoing)
- An analysis of the project or policy change that extends current thinking or ideas
- The clarity in which the project purpose, approach, impact and significance has been described

REVIEWING GUIDELINES:

1. APPROPRIATENESS OF OBJECTIVES AND STUDY DESIGN (0-5)

OPTION ONE RESEARCH-BASED

Appropriateness of the methodology and Study design (0-5)

- Is the study design appropriate to the hypothesis or aims/objectives of the study?
- Is the methodology used appropriately for that study?
- Are the data analysis and the inference done appropriately?

OPTION TWO PRACTICE-BASED

Quality of the Experience/Presentation (0-5)

- Are the aims/approaches appropriate to the issue/theme?
- Does the project or policy address the purpose/aims?
- Does the impact or significance clearly relate to the aims and approach?

2. CLARITY OF METHODOLOGY, ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS (0-5)

OPTION ONE RESEARCH-BASED

Clarity of Purpose and objectives of the study (0-5)
- Is the background of the study appropriate and updated?
- Are the Objectives clear and well presented?
- Are the conclusions clear and appropriate to the study?

OPTION TWO PRACTICE-BASED

Clarity of the reported experience/observations (0-5)
- Is the description of the background and purpose clear?
- Is the description of the approach clear and well presented?
- Is the statement of impact clear and appropriate to the project or policy?

3. SIGNIFICANCE OF CONTRIBUTION (0-5)

OPTION ONE RESEARCH-BASED

Significance of contribution (0-5)
- Does it provide innovative/new insights from any perspective?
- Applicability of the study
- Importance to the Australasian HIV&AIDS Conference?
- What might be the implications for health policy or programming?

OPTION TWO PRACTICE-BASED

Significance of the contribution (0-5)
- Does the contribution provide significant and useful information?
- Are there benefits for other partners in the sector from hearing about the work?
- Is there potential for adoption in other settings or other impacts of the initiative/program?
- Does this address an issue of importance to the Australasian HIV/AIDS Conference?

SCORING GUIDELINES:

5: Very Good
Research-based abstracts:
- Research is based on an original concept, methodology and study design appropriate.
- Data analysis is clear and provides clear, high-quality results.
- Important or new results with the potential to change practice.

Practice-based abstracts:
- Contribution is innovative, and the topic area highly relevant to the HIV response
- The approach is clear and has some distinctive value
- Statement of impact offers practical insights that are likely to change practice
- Practice led to demonstrable and desired changes in knowledge, behaviours or beliefs in the target audience

4: Good
Research-based abstracts:
- Objectives, methodology and study design are clearly described/appropriate.
- Data analysis provides clear, good quality data.
- Results are strong and relevant to the conference.

Practice-based abstracts:
- Contribution is clearly described and of interest to the HIV response
- Approach is clear
- Statement of impact, and that the impact has some implications for practice
- Abstract describes how evidence and data have informed practice, and the feedback loop to inspire further research has been facilitated

3: Average
- Abstract contains information from which colleagues within the same field of interest can learn
- Abstract takes a common approach used in practice across Australia but takes a different approach to implementation that provides new insights

2: Below Average
- Redundant research/information.
- Poor quality of data or analysis, insufficient detail.
- No substantial improvement in knowledge.

1: Poor or Incomplete
- Abstract is formally incorrect, and prescribed sections are missing.
- Insufficient information to assess research question, methodology or results.

RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION TYPE
Oral Presentation, Poster, or Rejected. A guide is shown below based on the score; however, you may also determine that although the quality is high, the information could be presented in poster format. Where there is the possibility of more than one option, please select your recommendation. The Committee will base the final programme on the reviewers' scoring results.

70% – 100%:	Oral Presentation
50% - 70%:	Poster
30% – 50%:	Poster or Reject
Less than 30%:	Reject