



vh2026

16th Australasian Viral Hepatitis Conference Abstract Guidelines Workshops & Symposia

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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical science Biomedical science (e.g. laboratory-based) 	Abstracts will present research that seeks to improve the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of viral hepatitis
Epidemiology and Public Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Economics Health services and systems Mathematical modelling 	Abstracts will present research on the social, cultural, environmental, occupational, and economic factors that affect those living with viral hepatitis
Social Science & Policy Research	Abstracts may include empirical or non-empirical (conceptual/theoretical) studies which focus on social, structural, cultural, material and policy contexts. They may include evaluations of policies, analysis of policy making processes, analysis of stakeholders to policy, and analysis of policy statements. They may include studies of lived experience, from patient and provider perspectives.
Models of Care and Programs <i>Including, but not limited to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community focused programs Nurse-led models of care Multidisciplinary models of care Integrated models of care Telemedicine and remote care Patient-centered care Innovative models of care 	Abstracts will focus on real-world examples of innovative models of care, programs, or interventions to enhance health care delivery for people living with viral hepatitis
Cross Track	Abstracts focusing on a topic across a range of disciplines

Topics

The conference encourages submissions on the following topics:

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Workers
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Practitioners
- Cascades of care/linkage to care
- Community engagement
- Diagnostics
- Drug treatment
- Drug Use
- Education and health promotion
- Harm reduction
- Integrated models of care
- Law and human rights
- Mobile outreach
- Nursing and Midwifery
- Other First Nations/Indigenous Health
- Policy
- Pregnancy/Mother to child transmission
- Prevention
- Primary care
- Prisons
- Stigma and discrimination
- Tertiary care
- Testing
- Viral hepatitis mono-infection
- Viral hepatitis and HIV coinfection
- Other

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
Workshops	60 – 90 minutes	<p>Workshops are interactive information /training sessions and should facilitate discussion and engage with the participants.</p> <p>Lecture-style presentation should be kept to a minimum; workshops are a facilitation exercise. Consider the participants' objectives and the desired learning outcomes, i.e. What is being taught, or what is the specific skill development?</p> <p>Workshop presenters must provide an outline of the structure/plan for the session, including learning objectives and how they will maximise participant hand on experience and discussion /interaction.</p> <p>Abstracts that do not fit the above requirements will not be considered.</p>
Symposia	60 – 90 minutes	<p>Symposia provide an opportunity to present on a common topic or theme from multiple standpoints or disciplines, to provide a coherent flow for discussion and bring new insights.</p> <p>A symposium could include multiple different “lecture style” presentations or be more interactive by including a panel or debate.</p> <p>If choosing to submit a panel or debate the abstract should include a clear description of the topic to be discussed and outline how the discussion will be managed between the panellists and between the panellists and the audience.</p> <p>You <u>must</u> include members of the community as presenters/panellists (e.g. Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander people, people with lived/living experience) in the symposia to ensure affected communities have a voice and are part of the solution.</p> <p>Symposia should include presentations / presenters from multiple institutions. Symposia that do not include multiple institutions will not be accepted.</p> <p>Symposia should be submitted on ONE template and not as separate presentations.</p>

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.

[Symposium Template](#)

[Panel Symposium Template](#)

[Workshop Template](#)

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 affected communities in Viral Hepatitis

Requirement 1: If your research is about viral hepatitis and involves gathering data, lived experiences, biological samples or other aspects from the bodies or lives of people living with viral hepatitis and our participation as people living with viral hepatitis has influenced your work, we encourage you to consider and build upon the sample text provided as an acknowledgement of the role that people living with viral hepatitis have played in the response to viral hepatitis at the beginning of any presentation of your work. Examples below:

Example 1: "I want to begin my presentation by thanking the people living with Viral Hepatitis who have participated in this research. Our fight against Viral Hepatitis Elimination is indebted to people living with Viral Hepatitis both past and present."

Example 2. "I want to begin by acknowledging and thanking the people living with Viral Hepatitis who have generously participated in this research."

Requirement 2: When developing your presentation, we also request that presenters outline how your work has had/ can have a positive impact on the community including key population groups (e.g. Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander peoples, People who Inject Drugs, CALD) and what steps are being taken to take the research into practice.

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' / facilitators names including the abstract submitter as the primary presenting author / facilitator 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' / facilitators affiliations
- Abstract title
- Abstract as a word document (see templates for word limit) plus a disclosure of interest statement
- Abstract must also be copied into the fields provided
- Short biography of presenter/facilitator (maximum 50 words). This information will be used by the session chair for introductory purposes and may be published in conference literature

Please contact the Conference Secretariat by emailing conference@ashm.org.au or calling +61 458 291 166 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 on the conference website, app 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 (including poster presenters) will be required to register for the conference by **Sunday 19 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.

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.

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.

Symposium abstracts

Rationale and aims for the symposium/panel/debate are clear, and relevant/up to date (1-5)

- Excellent (score 5) There is a strong rationale provided. The aims are well-defined, highly coherent, original in concept or innovative. The abstracts included form a highly coherent group that flows well. The discussion session is described & conceptualised well and highly topical and innovative. The symposium is likely to be executed well and highly engaging and stimulate discussion with the audience. The discussion will provide important, innovative or new information. The symposium contains a well-balanced range of abstracts on the topic.
- Good (score 4) A clear rationale is provided. The aims are clear in intent and logical. The discussion session is appropriate, described well, topical and innovative. The abstracts included form a coherent group that flows well. The symposium discussion is likely to be engaging and stimulate discussion with the audience. The discussion will advance knowledge and practice and have the potential to influence practice, communities and policy. The symposium contains a well-balanced range of abstracts on the topic.
- Average (score 3) A sound rationale is provided for the presenter symposium. The aims are somewhat clear. The presenter discussion questions are adequately described, somewhat topical but lack innovation. The discussion section has some engaging and interactive elements. The discussion is likely to extend existing knowledge and practice, with some impact on communities, policy and First Nations communities. The abstracts contain relevant knowledge and experience in the field.
- Poor (score 2) The rationale for and aims of the of the presenter symposium is unclear. The discussion section is not described well, inappropriate or the content is not relevant. The symposium has few interactive elements and is unlikely to extend existing knowledge or practice and there is no description of implications (or likely benefit to) on communities, practice, policy or First Nations communities. The abstracts contain limited knowledge and experience in the field.
- Very poor (score 1) No relation to the conference theme and insufficient information provided on the rationale, aims or approach for the symposium. The basis for the approach is flawed or the abstract does not meet prescribed format etc. The abstracts are of poor quality and no clear discussion strategy is described or the discussion is of limited interest or relevance to the field. No description of implications on communities, practice, policy or First Nations communities. The abstracts contain little or no information, with no discussion section and is not well-balanced.

The discussion section is described well, appropriate and innovative; procedures for engaging discussion with the audience are clear (1-5)

- Excellent (5) Detailed, coherent, and innovative discussion plan. Specific engagement procedures (e.g., structured Q&A, debate, live polling, small-group tasks) are clearly described with roles, timing, and flow. Methods suit the topic and audience; moderation and timekeeping are planned. Feasible within constraints with basic contingencies and a way to capture outputs.
- Good (4) Clear, logical plan with multiple engagement methods. Most roles/timings are specified; approaches are appropriate and show some innovation. Likely to be engaging and feasible; minor gaps (e.g., limited contingency or output capture) do not affect overall quality.
- Average (3) A basic, serviceable plan with at least one audience engagement procedure. Limited detail on roles, timing, or moderation. Appropriateness is acceptable; innovation modest. Engagement is plausible but not well evidenced.
- Poor (2) Vague or loosely described plan. Engagement procedures are unclear, poorly matched to the format, or impractical within the time/setting. Feasibility concerns and weak moderation planning.
- Very poor (1) Minimal or unsuitable plan; essentially lecture-style with no workable audience engagement. Not feasible or unlikely to generate meaningful discussion.

Discussion will likely result in new, innovative or novel ideas; OR make a significant contribution to policy or practice (1-5)

- Excellent (5) A clear, credible pathway to tangible outputs or adoption is articulated (e.g., draft recommendations, toolkit, consensus points) with roles, timelines, and next steps. Engagement of relevant end-users/decision-makers is described; feasibility is high and the anticipated impact is significant.
- Good (4) Strong potential for innovation or policy/practice contribution. Proposed outputs and an adoption pathway are outlined, though less detailed. Relevant stakeholders are considered; feasibility appears good and impact likely.
- Average (3) Some potential for incremental ideas or modest practice insights. Outputs are generic and the path to uptake is only partially specified. Stakeholder involvement and feasibility are plausible but under-developed.
- Poor (2) Low likelihood of generating new ideas or meaningful change. Impact claims are vague; no clear outputs or route to adoption. Stakeholder engagement and feasibility are weak.
- Very poor (1) No credible contribution to innovation, policy, or practice. Off-topic or impractical; no outputs, no stakeholders, and no plan for translation.

Symposium contains a well-balanced range of abstracts that flow together and are relevant in the area / Panel contains a well-balanced range of speakers with relevant expertise in the area (1-5)

- Excellent (5) Outstanding balance and coherence. Selections cover the key subtopics with complementary perspectives and appropriately varied expertise. Sequencing creates a clear narrative with strong linkages between items; minimal redundancy. Relevance to the field is uniformly high.
- Good (4) Clear balance across most key dimensions with strong overall flow. Minor gaps or small overlaps only. Expertise mix is appropriate and well justified; relevance is high for most components.
- Average (3) Acceptable mix but with noticeable gaps (e.g., missing a key angle) or some duplication. Flow is serviceable but uneven; rationale for ordering/selection only partly articulated. Relevance generally sound.
- Poor (2) Imbalanced or weakly matched selections. Several items are only loosely relevant. Flow is fragmented with unclear connections; expertise is narrow or uneven.
- Very poor (1) Lacks balance and coherence. Items are largely disconnected or off-topic, with mismatched or insufficient expertise. Unlikely to provide a meaningful overview of the area.

Workshop Abstracts

Background and clarity of objectives of the workshop (1-5)

- Excellent (5) Compelling background that defines a clear gap/need and target audience. Objectives are clear, specific, and achievable within the session. They link directly to the background, state expected outcomes/skills, note any prerequisites, and align explicitly with the conference themes.
- Good (4) Clear background and logical aims with strong alignment to themes. Objectives are mostly specific and session-appropriate; minor omissions (e.g., brief or implicit outcomes/prerequisites) do not affect overall clarity.
- Average (3) Sound but generic background. Objectives are present but partly vague, broad, or only loosely tied to the stated need. Alignment to themes and intended audience is stated but not well developed.
- Poor (2) Background is weak or unclear; the need and audience are not well defined. Objectives are vague, inconsistent, or unrealistic for the time available. Limited or unclear alignment to themes.
- Very poor (1) Minimal or no background provided. Objectives are absent, irrelevant, or off-theme; submission does not meet basic guidance for clarity.

Educational value of the workshop and applicability of content to the conference themes (1-5)

- Excellent (5) High educational yield with clearly defined learning outcomes. Content is current, accurate, and directly mapped to the conference themes. Provides practice-ready skills/tools (e.g., checklists, templates, algorithms) with clear use cases and follow-up resources. Strong potential to improve practice or decision-making across settings.
- Good (4) Strong relevance to themes and up-to-date content. Delivers useful techniques and examples with some take-away resources. Likely to enhance practice for most participants; minor gaps in specificity or breadth only.
- Average(3) Moderately relevant and mostly informational. Outcomes are generic; limited emphasis on skills transfer. Evidence or resources are present but light. Applicability to themes and roles is plausible but under-developed.
- Poor (2) Low relevance to themes or dated/superficial content. Educational benefit is unclear; few or no practical take-aways. Limited evidence base and weak connection to participants' roles.
- Very poor (1) Off-theme, promotional, or unreliable content. No meaningful learning outcomes or applicability; unlikely to benefit attendees.

Quality of the workshop structure, evidence of interactivity, innovative format, methods (1-5)

- Excellent (5) Detailed agenda with clear timings, roles, and flow. Multiple, well-matched interactive methods (e.g., case work, role-play/simulation, small-group tasks, live polling) tied to objectives. Innovative but feasible format (e.g., flipped classroom, design sprint) with instructions, materials/tech, room setup, and contingencies specified. Plan to capture outputs and brief participant feedback.
- Good (4) Clear structure and several interactive elements; roles/timings mostly defined. Some innovation with good feasibility. Materials/tech and setup noted; minor gaps (e.g., limited contingency or output capture).
- Average (3) Basic structure with at least one interactive activity. Limited detail on timing, roles, or instructions. Innovation modest; feasibility acceptable but not well evidenced. Output capture/feedback only partially addressed.
- Poor (2) Loose or unclear structure. Interactivity is token or poorly matched to objectives; heavy reliance on lecture. Feasibility concerns (timing, tech, or room setup). No practical plan to capture outputs or manage participation.
- Very poor (1) No workable structure; lecture-only or impractical activities. Engagement methods absent; materials/tech/setup unspecified. Unlikely to run successfully within the allotted time.

Expertise and experience of proposed speakers/facilitators (1-5)

- Excellent (5) Strong subject-matter expertise and proven facilitation/teaching track record. Complementary skills across the team (e.g., clinical, research, implementation) with clearly defined roles. Evidence of prior high-quality workshops or training (evaluations, publications, guideline work). Conflicts declared and managed; availability confirmed.

- Good (4) Solid expertise with good facilitation experience. Team mix is appropriate, though slightly uneven or with minor role overlap. Some evidence of prior delivery and outputs. Conflicts addressed; availability likely.
- Average (3) Acceptable topic knowledge; limited or mixed facilitation experience. Team skews toward one perspective; roles and responsibilities partially specified. Limited documentation of prior workshops or outputs.
- Poor (2) Gaps in subject expertise and little evidence of effective facilitation. Team composition is narrow or mismatched; roles unclear. Minimal proof of prior delivery; conflicts/availability not well addressed.
- Very poor (1) Insufficient or irrelevant expertise; no facilitation capability demonstrated. Roles absent, conflicts undeclared, or availability uncertain. Unlikely to deliver a credible workshop.

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:
 - Drafting content or summaries
 - Data analysis
 - Language editing or translation
 - 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.