

Society for Social Medicine & Population Health (SSM) 69th Annual Scientific Meeting

Abstract and Workshop Application Assessment Criteria 2025

The 69th SSM Annual Scientific Meeting 2025 welcomes abstracts on health services research, health policy, public health, economics, psychology, epidemiology, statistics, data science, policy translation, knowledge mobilisation qualitative research and/or mixed methods research.

All submissions will be reviewed by **four** independent assessors using the advisory criteria below. **Eligibility for 15-minute (full) oral presentation, 5-minute (rapid-fire) oral presentation and poster presentation will be determined by the total score across the four reviews, with adjustment for differential scoring behaviour between referees.** The 'priority & relevance' score may also be used to inform secondary decisions, such as choosing between tied abstracts and selecting plenary presentations.

Advisory criteria for applied research abstracts

Title / Structured Headings / Overall Presentation:

Is the title specific, adequate, and concise? E.g., Does it accurately describe the population studied, the study design or method of data collection or analysis, the research objective or question?

Introduction/ Objectives / Hypotheses or Research Question(s):

Is the context made clear? Is the scientific rationale clearly stated? Are the aims, objectives, hypotheses, or research question(s) clearly stated?

Methods:

For all types of study, are the Methods clearly described? Are the data sources clearly specified? Are the methods, analytical techniques and software tools specified? Are the methods appropriate to the question being investigated?

For qualitative studies: Are qualitative methods appropriate to answering the research questions/addressing research objectives? Are the recruitment method(s), sample population(s), methods of data collection, and methods of data analyses described and appropriate?

For quantitative, observational experimental or modelling studies: Are the sample frame(s), sampling method(s), sample population(s), intervention and control conditions, methods of data collection, main outcome measures, assumptions, and statistical methods all clear and appropriate?

For mixed methods: Is there appropriate use of quantitative/qualitative methods, each clearly described, in an order that makes sense, and each appropriately integrated at the right stage of the analysis/interpretation?

Systematic reviews: Should state objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, search strategy (e.g. data/text mining), participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods (e.g. meta-analysis, meta-regression, narrative synthesis, meta-ethnography). Has the risk of bias and quality of the included studies been considered?

Results:

Are results available and described appropriately to be confident that sufficient material will be presented at the conference? Abstracts should not say only that 'results will be presented'.

For quantitative, observational experimental or mixed methods studies: Do data presented give a clear indication of precision, favouring confidence intervals over p-values? Do modelling studies present sensitivity analyses? For qualitative and mixed methods studies: Are the sample characteristics described? Are themes and/or categories presented systematically and meaningfully? Is the context in which data were produced recognised in the language used, for example, are data recognised as reported?

For mixed methods: Describe the data resulting from each method as well as integrated analyses.

Systematic reviews: Should report search results at each stage plus main outcomes.

Conclusions

Are the conclusions clear and concise? Do they reflect the aims and objectives? Are they supported by the results presented? Are key study limitations acknowledged? Where appropriate, are the implications made clear for policy, practice, and further research?

Priority and relevance

Is it novel/exciting/much better methodologically than other studies in the area? Would it appeal to a broad (social medicine) audience? Does it have the potential to create impact (e.g. change clinical or public health practice or policy, improve health, reduce inequalities in health, change the course of science)?

Advisory criteria for methodological abstracts

Title:

Is the title clear, relevant, and concise?

Background:

Is the context clearly introduced? Are the aims, objectives, or question(s) clearly stated? Is a rationale provided for the research?

Methods:

Are the methods clearly described? Are they appropriate for the aims, objectives, or question(s)?

Results:

Are results provided (however brief)? Are they clearly described? Are they relevant to the aims, objectives, or question(s) and described in sufficient detail to address those aims? Abstracts should not say that 'results will be presented'.

Discussion

Is the discussion clear? Does it suitably contextualise the findings? Do the conclusions reflect the aims, objectives, or question(s)? Are they supported by the results presented? Are any relevant implications made clear? Are limitations acknowledged?

Priority and relevance

Is it novel and/or exciting? Would it appeal to the multi-disciplinary audience? Does it have the potential to improve population health research?