



2nd Annual Global Prisons Infectious Diseases Conference Abstract Guidelines

For your presentation to be considered, abstract guidelines must be followed as closely as possible. Please ensure that the presenting author completes the abstract submission prior to the deadline.

Theme/Discipline	Explanation
Clinical Sciences	Abstracts should present research aimed at improving the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and management of infectious diseases among incarcerated and detained populations, including continuity of care post-release.
Epidemiology and Public Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health Economics • Health services • Mathematical modelling 	Abstracts should explore burden of disease, transmission dynamics, health service delivery, and structural drivers of infection in prisons and detention centers, including impacts on community health.
Implementation science	This theme focuses on how evidence-based infectious disease interventions are effectively implemented and sustained in prison and detention settings, including strategies to overcome system barriers and improve real-world impact.
Social Science & Policy Research	Abstracts may include empirical or conceptual studies addressing structural determinants of infection in incarceration, criminal legal policy and health outcome, human rights, stigma, lived experience of incarceration, policy implementation and reform.
Use of innovative technologies & artificial intelligence	Abstracts should focus on implementation of innovative technologies (e.g. novel imaging strategies) and use of artificial intelligence for management of infectious diseases in carceral settings.

Topics

The conference encourages submissions on the following topics:

- Infectious disease prevention in prisons
- HIV, Viral hepatitis, and STI care among incarcerated populations



- Tuberculosis control in carceral facilities
- Outbreak preparedness and response
- Continuity of care post-release
- Harm reduction in carceral settings
- Indigenous and marginalized populations in custody
- Health equity and human rights
- Screening, diagnostics, and treatment access
- Co-infections and multimorbidity
- Women’s health in detention
- Policy reform and decarceration impacts

Types of Presentations

Authors should state a preference for one of the following and address the abstract to one of the conference themes above.

Presentation type	Time Allocation	Explanation
Research-Based Oral Presentations	Standard Oral - 12 minutes presentation and 3 minutes question time OR Rapid Fire - 4 minutes presentation and 1 minute question time	Oral presentations on original research findings, case studies, completed projects and theoretical analyses. Presentations should be well structured, rigorous and demonstrate a novel contribution to knowledge.

Abstract Preparation Guidelines for All Presentations

Abstract templates are provided below and **MUST** be referred to prior to writing your abstract. Submitters must ensure they use the correct template for their abstract type and follow all instructions provided.

Note: If abstract guidelines are not conformed to and the templates provided are not used, the abstract will be rejected and not submitted for review.

Acknowledgement of Incarcerated Communities (Updated Language)

If your work involves people who are incarcerated or formerly incarcerated, presenters are encouraged to acknowledge their contributions. Example language:

“We acknowledge and thank people who are incarcerated and formerly incarcerated who have contributed their experiences, data, and trust to this work. Efforts to control infectious diseases in prisons are indebted to those most affected.”

Presenters should also describe:

- How findings benefit incarcerated populations
- Steps toward real-world implementation
- Engagement with affected communities

Online Abstract Submission

Abstracts must be submitted electronically through the online submission site. You can access the site via the conference website. You will be required to enter:

- Preferred theme/discipline



- Topics
- Preferred presentation type
- Authors names, including the abstract submitter as the presenting author and contact details - address, telephone and email. Note: Abstract presenters will be required to fund their own attendance at the conference and should not submit an abstract if this is not possible. Scholarships are available and preference will be given to those who do submit abstracts; however authors should ensure they are able to fund their own travel if need be.
- Authors' affiliations
- Abstract title
- Abstract as a word document (maximum 300 words) plus a disclosure of interest statement
- Abstract must also be copied into the fields provided
- Short biography of presenter (maximum 50 words). This information will be used by the session chair for introduction purposes and may be published in conference literature

Please contact the Conference Secretariat by emailing conference@ashm.org.au or calling +61 (2) 8204 0770 if you are unable to lodge your abstract via the website or if you have any queries. We recommend using Firefox, or Google Chrome as your browser to access the online submission site.

By submitting an abstract all authors agree to release the license to the Conference organisers and give permission to publish the abstract in the conference handbook, website, application, USB etc. and in so doing certify that the abstract is original work. If your abstract is successful, it will be published on the conference website on the date of notification of success.

Conference Registration

Abstract presenters will be required to fund their own attendance at the conference and should not submit an abstract if this is not possible. All presenters will be required to register for the conference by **Thursday 2 July 2026**. It will be assumed that any presenter not registered by this date has withdrawn from the program and their abstract will be removed from the handbook.

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:

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

AI Declaration

As part of our commitment to transparency and ethical standards in research and professional development, ASHM requires that all conference abstract submissions include a declaration regarding the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the development or creation of the submission materials. Using AI to entirely generate your submission is not an acceptable use of AI. The majority of the submission must be written by you.

You will be asked to answer the following declaration questions:

1. Has AI been used in the preparation, drafting, or editing of any part of this submission, including data analysis, or language editing? (Yes/No)
2. If AI was used, please describe its specific role. For example:
3. Drafting content or summaries
4. Data analysis
5. Language editing or translation
6. Other (please provide detail)

Note: Submissions that use AI are eligible for review, but submissions without an AI declaration or those that contain unacknowledged AI-generated content may be subject to disqualification.