



## 14th Australasian Viral Hepatitis Conference Abstract Selection Criteria

All abstracts will be reviewed by three independent peer reviewers. Abstracts will be provided a score out of 20 points based on the following criteria:

### Research-based abstracts

#### **Background and clarity of objectives of the study (0-5)**

Is the background of the study and objectives clear and well-presented?

- Excellent (score 5) - The background/rationale is exceptionally clear, the research is novel and fills a significant gap in the literature, and there is a very clearly stated objective
- Very good (score 4) – The background/rationale is very clear, the research is novel and fills a significant gap in the literature, and there is a very clearly stated objective
- Good (score 3) – The background/rationale is clear, the research is interesting, and fills a gap in the literature, and there is a clearly stated objective
- Average (score 2) – The background/rationale is stated, the research confirms previous findings, and the objective is stated
- Below average (score 1) – The background/rationale is not well stated, the research is not very novel, and the objective is not well stated
- Very poor (score 0) – The abstract has no background/rationale, the research is not relevant, and the abstract is missing a clearly defined objective

#### **Appropriateness of the study design and methodology (0-5)**

Is the methodology and study design appropriate for the hypothesis or aims/objectives of the study?

- Excellent (score 5) - The methods are exceptionally clear, the study design and methodology are entirely appropriate to evaluate the stated objectives, and the statistical analyses are entirely appropriate.
- Very good (score 4) – The methods are very clear, the study design and methodology are very appropriate to evaluate the stated objectives, and the statistical analyses are very appropriate.
- Good (score 3) – The methods are clear, the study design and methodology are appropriate to evaluate the stated objectives, and the statistical analyses are appropriate.
- Average (score 2) – The methods lack some clarity, there are limitations to the study design and methodology for evaluating the stated objectives, and the statistical analyses have some limitations.
- Below average (score 1) – The methods lack clarity, there are major limitations to the study design and methodology for evaluating the stated objectives, and the statistical analyses have major limitations or are incorrectly applied for the intended aims.
- Very poor (score 0) – The methods are not clear, there are major limitations to the study design and methodology for evaluating the stated objectives which make the study uninterpretable, and the statistical analyses are very poor and/or are incorrectly applied for the intended aims.

#### **Appropriateness of the study results (0-5)**

Are the results appropriate for the hypothesis or aims/objectives of the study?

- Excellent (score 5) - The results are very well presented, do an excellent job at supporting the aims/objectives of the study, and provide very novel findings.



- Very good (score 4) – The results are very clearly presented, do a very good job at supporting the aims/objectives of the study, and provide very novel findings.
- Good (score 3) – The results are clearly and adequately presented, do a good job at supporting the aims/objectives of the study, and provide interesting findings.
- Average (score 2) – The results lack some clarity in presentation, or some required results were not reported, do a reasonable job at supporting the aims/objectives of the study, and provide some interesting findings with some limitations in how they are presented.
- Below average (score 1) – The results lack clarity in presentation, or most required results were not reported, do not support the aims/objectives of the study, and provide a lack of interesting findings with major limitations in how they are presented.
- Very poor (score 0) – The results are not clear, or all required results were not reported, do not support the aims/objectives of the study, and provide a lack of interesting findings with major limitations in how they are presented.

## Conclusions (0-5)

Are the conclusions clear, are they supported by the findings and does this work significantly contribute to the literature?

- Excellent (score 5) - The conclusions are exceptionally well presented and are well-supported by the findings. The work is an excellent contribution to evidence-based knowledge in the field.
- Very good (score 4) – The conclusions are very clearly presented and are well-supported by the findings. The work is a very good contribution to evidence-based knowledge in the field.
- Good (score 3) – The conclusions are clearly presented and are supported by the findings. The work is a good contribution to evidence-based knowledge in the field.
- Average (score 2) – The conclusions are adequately presented and are partially supported by the findings. The work contributes somewhat to evidence-based knowledge in the field.
- Below average (score 1) – The conclusions lack clarity in their presentation and do not support the findings. The work does not contribute to evidence-based knowledge in the field.
- Very poor (score 0) – The conclusions are not at all clear in their presentation and do not support the findings. The work does not contribute to evidence-based knowledge in the field.

**Note:** Research Abstracts may be favoured at review if they 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

## Models of Care and Programs/Multimedia

### Background and clarity of objectives of the model of care/program (0-5)

Is the background to the development of the model of care clear and well-presented? Are the objectives of the model of care clear and well-presented?

- Excellent (score 5) - The background/rationale is exceptionally clear and well-presented and there are well-defined objectives to support development of the model of care



- Very good (score 4) – The background/rationale is very clear and there are very clearly stated objectives
- Good (score 3) – The background/rationale is clear and there are clearly stated objectives
- Average (score 2) – The background/rationale is stated and objectives are stated
- Below average (score 1) – The background/rationale is not well stated and the objective is not well stated
- Very poor (score 0) – The abstract has no background/rationale and the abstract is missing a clearly defined objective

### **Description of the model of care/intervention (0-5)**

Is the model of care/intervention well described? Is the model of care/intervention innovative in its setting, population, messaging or implementation?

- Excellent (score 5) - The model of care/intervention is exceptionally well described and is very innovative in its setting, population, messaging or implementation
- Very good (score 4) – The model of care/intervention is very well described and is very innovative in its setting, population, messaging or implementation
- Good (score 3) – The model of care/intervention is well described and is innovative in its setting, population, messaging or implementation
- Average (score 2) – The model of care/intervention lacks some clarity and is not very innovative in its setting, population, messaging or implementation
- Below average (score 1) – The model of care/intervention lacks clarity and is not innovative in its setting, population, messaging or implementation
- Very poor (score 0) – The model of care/intervention is not clear and is not innovative in its setting, population, messaging or implementation

### **Appropriateness of the study effectiveness (0-5)**

Is the data presented appropriate for monitoring the effectiveness of the model of care/program/intervention?

- Excellent (score 5) - The data is exceptionally well presented and entirely appropriate for monitoring the effectiveness of the model of care/intervention
- Very good (score 4) – The data is very clearly presented and very appropriate for monitoring the effectiveness of the model of care/intervention
- Good (score 3) – The data is clearly presented and appropriate for monitoring the effectiveness of the model of care/intervention
- Average (score 2) – The data lacks some clarity in how it will be appropriate to monitor the effectiveness of the model of care/intervention, but may work
- Below average (score 1) – The data lacks clarity and is unlikely to be appropriate for monitoring the effectiveness of the model of care/intervention
- Very poor (score 0) – The data is not clear and will not be appropriate for monitoring the effectiveness of the model of care/intervention

### **Conclusions and next steps (0-5)**

Are the conclusions clear, are they supported by the findings from the model of care/program implementation? Are key learnings from this model clearly defined? Are the next steps for this model clearly defined? Does this work significantly contribute to the field?

- Excellent (score 5) – The conclusions are very clearly presented and well supported by the findings. Key learnings and next steps for the model are very clearly defined. The work is an excellent contribution to the field.



# vh2024

- Very good (score 4) – The conclusions are very clearly presented and are well-supported by the findings. Key learnings and next steps for the model are clearly defined. The work is a very good contribution to the field.
- Good (score 3) – The conclusions are clearly presented and are supported by the findings. Key learnings and next steps for the model are clearly defined. The work is a good contribution to the field.
- Average (score 2) – The conclusions are adequately presented and are partially supported by the findings. Key learnings and next steps for the model are somewhat defined. The work contributes somewhat to the field
- Below average (score 1) – The conclusions lack clarity in their presentation and do not support the findings. Key learnings and next steps for the model are not clear. The work does not contribute to the field
- Very poor (score 0) – The conclusions are not at all clear in their presentation and do not support the findings. There are no stated key learnings or next steps for the model. The work does not contribute to the field.

**Note:** Practice-based Abstracts may 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
- Clarity in which the project purpose, approach, impact and significance has been described

In balancing the program, the committee may require authors to present their work in an alternate format (e.g. as a poster rather than oral presentation).

**Note:** We encourage abstracts with an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander focus to be presented by an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander person or have an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander co-presenter be included. If this is not possible, please include some information as to whether any member of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community in which the research is based was involved in development of the research protocol or in conducting the research. Where possible, this applies to other population groups as well.