

20th IUHPE World Conference on Health Promotion
Abstract Handling Process

This document was developed to explain the abstract submission, review and acceptance/ rejection steps that were undertaken for the 20th IUHPE World Conference on Health Promotion.

Abstract Submission

Call for abstracts for the Geneva 2010 conference was published on the 31st August, 2009 on the conference website. The same day, abstract submission systems in three languages: English, French and Spanish were opened. All abstract submitters were invited to submit abstracts for:

- Symposia – overall symposia abstract together with individual contributions for each oral presentation to be presented during the symposium
- Workshops – skills building and idea factory
- Traditional Oral Presentation
- Traditional Poster Presentation
- Electronic Poster Presentation

Deadline for abstract submission was 30th November, 2009. More than 2000 abstract in English, French and Spanish from more than 100 countries were submitted for the Geneva 2010 conference.

A total of:

- 1215 abstracts for oral presentation
- 450 abstracts for traditional posters
- 84 abstracts for electronic posters
- 68 abstracts for symposia (260 individual symposia papers)
- 160 abstracts for workshops
- 25 abstracts for other presentation types

were submitted.

Following the initial deadline, an extension was allowed until December 14, 2009. Further efforts were made to accommodate later submissions until Jan 1, 2010, for key partners and special sessions developed corresponding to IUHPE priority areas of work.

Abstract Review

Between October and November, 2009, more than 300 reviewers were recruited. All reviewers were invited to indicate their area of expertise and languages for review in order to make sure that this is taken into consideration when attributing abstract for review.

Each abstract (workshop, oral presentation, poster etc) was attributed to two reviewers. All symposia were reviewed as a whole package (overall abstract, as well as individual papers). In addition to that, all individual symposia papers received an additional review from two reviewers separately from the overall symposia abstract.

When reviewing abstracts, the reviewers were asked:

- For **oral presentation, poster, electronic poster and symposia individual papers** to:

- Indicate whether they can review a particular abstract: in case, the reviewer indicated that there is a conflict of interest, or if the abstract was not within the range of reviewers competence, particular review scores were not taken into account
 - Score abstract based on the following criteria: originality and creativity, clarity of content, contribution to the knowledge base/evidence base, and relevance and timeliness in terms of findings and conclusions. Score ranged from 0 (suggest for rejection) to 5 (very high quality)
 - Suggest change of presentation format
 - Provide any other comments (e.g. why an abstract was suggested for rejection, or what is specifically interesting about a particular abstract)
- For **workshops** to:
 - Indicate whether they can review a particular abstract: in case, the reviewer indicated that there is a conflict of interest, or if the abstract was not within the range of reviewers competence, particular review scores were not taken into account
 - Score abstract based on the following criteria: originality and creativity, clarity of content, clarity of learning goals/anticipated outcome, clarity of learning methods and format. Score ranged from 0 (suggest for rejection) to 5 (very high quality)
 - Suggest change of presentation format
 - Provide any other comments (e.g. why workshop was suggested for rejection, or what is specifically interesting about a particular workshop)
- For **symposia** (overall concept of the symposium, as well as 3-5 individual papers):
 - Indicate whether they can review a particular abstract: in case, the reviewer indicated that there is a conflict of interest, or if the abstract was not within the range of reviewers competence, particular review scores were not taken into account
 - Score abstract based on the following criteria: originality and creativity, clarity of content, contribution to the knowledge base/evidence base, and relevance and timeliness in terms of findings and conclusions, clarity of learning goals/anticipated outcome, diversity of gender and geographical representation. Score ranged from 0 (suggest for rejection) to 5 (very high quality)
 - Provide any other comments (e.g. why a symposium was suggested for rejection, or what is specifically interesting about a particular symposium)

All review scores were received by the conference secretariat on the 12th of January, 2010.

Abstract Selection Meeting (Marathon Meeting)

A Marathon Meeting took place from 26th to 29th January, 2010, in Céligny, Switzerland. 25 members of Global and Swiss Scientific Committees, as well as the Conference Didactics Working Group prepared the programme and decided which abstracts are to be rejected, and what format in which to programme those that were accepted.

In advance of the meeting, the Conference Secretariat prepared abstracts with review summaries and a programme decision form. Each abstract was printed out. Review scores, format change

suggestions and comments provided by reviewers were indicated on each abstract summary sheet. Also an overview with available time slots for parallel sessions, and places for posters was prepared in advance of the meeting.

In advance of the meeting, the conference secretariat provided the following framework for programme slotting.

- 132 time slots for workshops, symposia and oral presentation sessions
- 12 slots for electronic poster sessions
- and 1600 slots for posters (400 posters per day)

were identified.

Already in June, 2009, when preparing the Call for Abstracts, it was decided to give priority to:

- participative and innovative learning sessions, like workshops, electronic poster sessions and other alternative forms of presentation
- and proposals where many persons were involved in the organisation of the session (e.g. symposium)

when allocating time slots. This was communicated to all abstract submitters in the Call for Abstracts.

There were 3 working groups of the Marathon Meeting participants preparing the conference programme:

- workshop and electronic poster session group
- symposia group
- oral session and poster group

Each group was asked to perform their job in several steps:

- confirm the decision about abstracts for rejection
- recommend the best format for abstracts to be presented
- identify the best session composition and time slots for the accepted abstracts based on the format

Step 1 – Rejection

All abstracts suggested for rejection by at least one reviewer were given to the working groups for consideration. In addition to that, the Marathon Meeting participants considered all abstracts that received scores 1-2 by reviewers.

Each working group was asked to review these cases once again and reject the abstract (based on reviewer feedback) or keep the abstract for further consideration.

Main criteria for rejection were:

- not addressing the topic and themes of the conference
- not related to health promotion
- inappropriate language
- insufficient information (either on content or format)

Step 2 – Format Change

Given the fact that there were many more oral presentations, workshops and symposium abstracts submitted than time slots and physical space available, each working group was asked to decide which abstract can be presented in what format based on the format suggestions made by reviewers and information provided in the abstract.

There was a significant discrepancy between the posters submitted and poster presentation slots available. It was decided that all abstracts submitted for poster presentations are to be accepted as poster presentations (apart from posters suggested and confirmed for rejection). It was also decided to move all abstracts, where Marathon Meeting participants considered that the findings can be presented in a poster format with clarity, to poster presentation. For all poster presenters there were several time slots (coffee breaks and lunches) identified when they can present their posters. All conference participants will be invited to attend the poster hall during the breaks in order to discuss with the poster authors their findings.

In addition to that, it was also decided to have several poster tours guided by eminent specialists on specific topics during the four days of the conference. This would allow for additional discussion and networking opportunities for poster authors and persons interested in a particular topic. Electronic posters also provide an innovative way to stimulate discussion, through quick presentations supported by images on related topics that can offer a diverse range of examples of work and practice to conference delegates in an engaging way.

During the Marathon Meeting several additional time slots were identified to accommodate more parallel sessions, in particular those that could rely on alternative formats and that did not require IT support. Some symposia submitted by only one person were moved to workshops to account for diversity of presenters expected from a symposium session. Nevertheless, some additional workshops and symposia had to be rejected at this stage on the basis that there were not sufficient time slots available and it was not possible to make these presentations in any other formats.

Finally, creative programming and intense dialogue were utilised to support this process. Submissions suggested for alternative formats went through discussion between the two working groups concerned. Some workshops and symposia were organically built from individual presentations that were deemed best suited together and could strengthen the synergy of the discussion of these issues and support knowledge exchange at the conference in a more strategic way.

Throughout the process, and for all types of submissions, specific attention was given to priority issues for the conference such as Indigenous health and sustainable development, in addition to strategic orientations and key portfolios of the IUHPE and its partners and the special considerations of the Swiss hosts and key stakeholders.

Step 3 – Programme Finalisation

On the last day of the Marathon Meeting, all Marathon Meeting participants prepared the final programme draft. Sessions and topics were spread over the conference days to ensure diversity of

themes discussed and make the programme attractive for participants with different thematic focuses.

As a result of the Marathon Meeting, a total of:

- 110 electronic posters (of those, French - 5; Spanish - 9) into 15 sessions
- 149 posters (of those, French - 4; Spanish - 4) as part of guided poster tours with 4 poster tours each day
- 1315 traditional posters (of those, French - 112; Spanish - 65)
- 234 oral presentations (of those, French - 7; Spanish - 13) for 47 Oral Presentation Sessions
- 205 symposia papers (of those, French -15; Spanish - 4) for 41 Symposia Session
- 89 Workshops (of those, French - 7; Spanish - 3)

were accepted.

170 abstracts (of those, French - 10; Spanish - 1) were rejected.

Abstract Notification

On 15th February, 2010 all abstract submitters were notified about their submissions: whether the abstract has been accepted, if accepted in what format and on what day the presentation will take place. All submitters of accepted abstract were asked to acknowledge the deadline for early bird registration to support the conference planning and to communicate changes in their presentation and register for the conference by 30th April, 2010 at the latest.

Instructions for presentations and posters (format, deadlines, preparations) will be posted and available on the conference website by 1st April 2010.