



Conference program submission guidelines

Conference program submission guidelines	1
Submission guidelines	1
Formatting guidelines	2
Program scheduling.....	3
Conflict of interest and disclosure	3
Presenter commitments and obligations	4
Review process	4
Review Rubric.....	5

Submission guidelines

Please ensure that you refer to the content required per presentation type under "Submission process" on the conference website, ensuring you complete all components of the submission. Submissions not in accordance with the provided guidelines will not be eligible for review.

- All submissions must be made via the relevant online submission portal. Emailed and incomplete submissions will not be considered for review.
- Submissions will not be accepted after the deadline.
- Submissions should be grounded in current or emerging quality evidence-based research or reflect the latest best practices in skill development in the field.
- Submissions should contain new information not previously published or presented unless there is a substantial update of data. This ensures the conference remains a platform for fresh, innovative ideas and promotes the sharing of new knowledge.
- Submissions should not include partisan commentary or political positions that fall outside the scope of occupational therapy practice.

- Submissions should use strengths based, inclusive, affirming, and respectful language that reflects how individuals and communities identify and describe themselves.
- All submissions that involve or consider Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Peoples or their data, must adhere with the [AIATSIS Code of Ethics](#).
- Submissions of a commercial or marketing nature will not be considered for the main program, and should in no way endorse a product, service, or program of any kind other than what is reasonably required for the purposes of education on your submission's topic or presenter's professional identification.

The Conference Organiser will not be held responsible for submission errors caused by internet service outages, hardware or software delays, power outages or unforeseen events.

Formatting guidelines

All submissions should follow the conference submission template. Please adhere to the following guidelines when preparing your submission:

- Submissions should be no longer than 250 words.
- Submissions should be text only. No diagrams, illustrations, tables, or graphics.
- Submissions should adhere to Australian English [spelling](#) and [grammar](#) conventions
e.g; Colourful lorikeets flew over the harbour in the centre of Melbourne;
- Format the presentation title in sentence case, using capitals where appropriate. e.g; An exploration of sentence structure; Understanding how meaning is built
- Use third-person narrative when describing your work e.g; Treatment of xxx will be presented; rather than I will discuss;
- When using abbreviations in the body of the submission, spell out the full term at the first mention, followed by the abbreviation in parentheses. Please ensure that all subsequent references use the established abbreviation. e.g; First mention; The National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) funds important health research projects in Australia; Subsequent references; NHMRC funded studies have led to significant advancements in medical science;
- To ensure a blind review process, avoid including any product names, affiliations/organisation names, or information that may identify you or your organisation in the submission.

NB; *The submitter is responsible for ensuring that the submission adheres to all guidelines and is free from typographical and grammatical errors prior to submitting.*

The provided submission will be utilised in its submitted form within the conference app/program.

Program scheduling

Accepted submissions will be scheduled together with other thematically related submissions. By submitting, you agree to be available for the duration of the conference. Any time constraints relating to the presentation date/time must be brought to the attention of the Conference Organiser when submitting.

Due to the large number of presentations included in the program, any request to alter allocated time slots cannot be guaranteed and will be considered on a case-by-case basis with respect to the impact on the whole program and other presenter(s).

The Conference Organiser reserves the right to change presentation dates and times if needed. In this instance every effort will be made to find an alternative presentation slot that is suitable to the presenter(s).

Conflict of interest and disclosure

Conflicts of interest (COI) are common and generally considered inevitable. COI are secondary interests (e.g., personal, commercial, political, academic, or financial) that may influence judgements of participants receiving the presentation. COI have been described as those which, when revealed later, would make a reasonable participant feel misled or deceived.

Financial interests may include employment, research funding, sponsorship, stock or share ownership, payment for lectures or travel, consultancies, company support for staff commissioning/funding/ sponsoring of any element of the paper, any financial or potential financial benefit, or PR firm involvement. This is not an exhaustive list of potential conflicts, rather an indication of the range of potential conflicts of interest.

The Conference Organiser takes the view that any potential COIs must be recognised and stated. If there is doubt about the existence of a conflict, it is preferable to err on the side of caution and make a disclosure. The intent of the disclosure is not to prohibit presenters from presenting, but rather to inform participants of any possible bias that presenters may have.

Disclosure must be done verbally and displayed in writing on a presentation slide at the beginning of a presentation. It may also be included in written conference materials.

Please note that the Conference Organiser reserves the right to rescind or withdraw any submission at any time, including after publication, if undeclared concerns with authorship, COI, plagiarism or content veracity and accuracy arise.

Presenter commitments and obligations

Submitting constitutes a formal commitment to present the work in-person at the conference.

The submitter signs for all co-presenter(s) and accepts responsibility for the present rules for submission and presentation on behalf of all co-presenter(s).

There are no reduced fees for presenters. All costs associated with presenting, including conference registration, travel, and accommodation, are the responsibility of the presenter.

NB; Only the accepted submissions of fully registered presenters will be included in the final conference program. Registration is required by April 2026. Failure to register by this date will result in your presentation being removed from the program.

Review process

To ensure an equitable and fair process, all submissions will be blind reviewed by experienced reviewers, evaluating their quality and relevance. The specific review criteria, in addition to adherence to the specified submission requirements, collectively determine the overall rating. Submissions will then be selected based on their scores and reviewers' feedback. Decisions reached during this process are considered final, without an appeal process available.

To maintain the integrity of the review process, it is the policy of the Conference Organiser not to release the details of those who reviewed the submissions. Due to the volume of submissions received, individual feedback is not feasible. As submissions are double-blind peer-reviewed, requests for reconsideration of the rating cannot be accommodated.

The Conference Organiser retains the right to accept or decline submissions based on reviewers' final decisions. Given the limited availability of presentation slots and our dedication to maintaining a high-quality conference program, we will not be able to accommodate all submissions. Submitters should anticipate the potential need for alternative presentation formats due to space constraints or other considerations.

OTX 2026 Presentation Review Rubric

Scoring Key: 5 – Excellent: Exceeds expectations, very strong in all criteria. 4 – Good: Strong overall, with only minor areas that could be improved. 3 – Satisfactory: Meets basic expectations but has room for improvement. 2 – Limited: Significant gaps or weaknesses. 1 – Poor: Does not meet minimum expectations or is unclear.	Review rubric		5	3	1
	Quality of the Presentation summary (25 points total)	Title (5)	Title is under 12 words, jargon-free, easy to understand, and clearly helps delegates decide relevance.	Title is somewhat long or uses minor jargon/abbreviations but still conveys the topic.	Title is unclear, too long, or full of acronyms/jargon, not helpful for delegates.
		Presentation Summary (15)	Summary is clear, concise, follows the suggested structure, and informative. Each required component is addressed with strong relevance to OT.	Summary includes most elements but may lack clarity, depth, or flow. Some jargon or vague descriptions may be present.	Summary is unclear, incomplete, or fails to convey the purpose and value of the presentation.
		NB. Workshops & Occupation Stations presentation summary must also include information on audience engagement	Summary provides comprehensive evidence of approach to audience engagement, with clear description of audience learning and contribution through active engagement.	Summary provides some evidence of approach to audience engagement, with vague description of audience learning and contribution through active engagement.	Unclear or missing evidence of approach to audience engagement
		Key Takeaways (5)	Clear, concise takeaways highlighting the core message. Strong link to OT practice. Easy to grasp and actionable.	General points provided. Some relevance or clarity but lacks depth or clear takeaways.	Vague, confusing, or missing takeaways. Unclear benefit to attendees.
	Educational Value (15 points)		Highly relevant and engaging for OT audience. Clear contribution to practice/research. Innovative or novel in concept or application.	Generally relevant and somewhat engaging. Contribution is clear but not distinctive.	Unclear relevance, limited educational value, or lacking innovation.
	Quality of Written Submission (10 points)		Writing is concise, self-contained, logically structured, jargon-free, and uses clear, active voice.	Mostly readable but includes some jargon, unnecessary quotes, or poor flow.	Difficult to read, lacks coherence, overly wordy or vague.