6th INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON WOMEN, WORK AND HEALTH

MAKING RISKS VISIBLE, PROTECTING RIGHTS

28·29·30 APRIL BARCELONA'27



GUIDE FOR THE EVALUATION OF ABSTRACTS FOR THE 6TH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON WOMEN, WORK AND HEALTH

Instructions for applying the guide

Each criterion will be scored on a scale of **0 to 5,** in accordance with the descriptors established in the guide.

No minimum total score is set for acceptance of the abstract. However, the following criteria are considered essential, and a minimum score of **3 – Adequate** must be achieved in each:

2.	**Relevance to the Congress**
4.	**Clarity and appropriateness of the objectives, design, and methodology**
6.	**Consistency between results and conclusions**
8.	**Quality of writing: clarity and linguistic correctness**

A score below **3 – Adequate** in any of these criteria will result in a proposal for non-acceptance of the abstract, regardless of the total score obtained.

Criteria for evaluation of submissions

Criterion	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Completely inadequate	Very poor	Insufficient	Adequate	Very good	Excellent
1. Compliance with the indicated structure and instructions (see Annex I)	Does not comply with the required structure or the essential instructions of the call for abstracts, or the information presented does not allow the work to be adequately identified.	Shows serious and widespread failures to comply with the instructions, substantially affecting the structure or the quality of the information needed to evaluate the work.	Shows significant failures to comply with the instructions or the required structure, although the general content of the work can be understood and assessed.	Generally complies with the established structure and instructions. May show some shortcomings that do not significantly affect the understanding or evaluation of the work.	Complies clearly and consistently with the established structure and instructions. Any shortcomings are minor and formal in nature.	Fully complies with the established structure and instructions, with no appreciable shortcomings, and presents the information in a complete, orderly, and effective manner for evaluation.
2. Relevance to the Congress	The abstract shows no identifiable relationship to occupational health or does not incorporate a sex-gender perspective, or, even if it does relate to these areas to some extent, it does not fit recognisably into any of the Congress's thematic areas.	The relationship to occupational health or to the sex-gender perspective is merely incidental, or its fit with the Congress's thematic areas is very weak. The work could be presented almost unchanged at a congress on a different topic.	Addresses either occupational health or the sex-gender perspective in a relevant way, but the other dimension is weakly developed or only mentioned, or it only partially fits the Congress's thematic areas.	There is a clear relationship to both occupational health and the sex-gender perspective, although the latter may be limited mainly to describing or comparing differences, and the submission clearly fits into at least one of the Congress's thematic areas.	Consistently integrates occupational health and the sex-gender perspective into the approach, analysis, or intervention, and clearly fits into one or more thematic areas, contributing to the Congress's objectives.	The relationship between work, health, and sex-gender is a central and cross-cutting element of the work, from its approach through to its results, conclusions, or proposals. It analyses sex-gender as a determinant of inequalities in occupational health and, where appropriate, incorporates an intersectional perspective. It fully fits one or more thematic areas and makes a particularly relevant contribution to the Congress's scientific objectives.

Criteria for evaluation of submissions

Criterion	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Completely inadequate	Very poor	Insufficient	Adequate	Very good	Excellent
3. Innovation and significance	No relevant, novel, or interesting contribution is identified. The content is incorrect, trivial, or lacks usefulness for the field of the Congress.	The contribution is very limited. It reproduces already established knowledge, actions, or approaches without providing new information, applications, analysis, or perspective of interest.	Shows some interest, but the novelty, relevance, or usefulness of the contribution is limited. Its potential contribution to knowledge, preventive practice, policy, organisations, or training is reduced.	The work addresses a relevant problem and provides information, evidence, experience, methodology, or application of interest, although its degree of innovation is moderate. Alternatively, it presents a novel proposal whose relevance, applicability, or potential impact is still limited.	The work is clearly relevant and presents a novel or particularly useful contribution to research, prevention, public policy, professional practice, organisations, or training. It shows significant potential for application or transfer in its field.	Combines a high degree of innovation with high relevance. It addresses an important or insufficiently studied issue and provides knowledge, evidence, approaches, interventions, or solutions with clear potential for application or transfer and for generating scientific, preventive, regulatory, training, organisational, or public-policy advances.
4. Clarity and appropriateness of the objectives, design, and methodology appropriateness of the objectives, design, and methodology	No evaluable objectives are identified, nor is the design, methodology, or process of development or implementation described, or there is a clear inconsistency between the objectives and the proposed design or methodology.	The objectives are not at all formulated clearly, or the design or methodology has serious shortcomings that do not allow proper assessment of how the study, policy, intervention, good practice, or training activity was carried out. There is insufficient correspondence between the objectives and the methodological approach.	The objectives, design, or methodology are described partially or imprecisely, and there are significant gaps that make it difficult to understand how the work was carried out. The correspondence between the objectives and the methods, procedures, or processes used is insufficiently demonstrated.	The objectives are clearly defined, and the design and methodology are understandable and appropriate to the objectives and to the type of work. In research, the population/sample, variables, and relevant methods or analyses are sufficiently described; in policies, good practices, or training, the context, target population, intervention or process and, where applicable, its evaluation are sufficiently explained.	The objectives are clearly formulated, and the design is well grounded. The methodology is described clearly and in sufficient detail, and there is good correspondence between the objectives, design, population or context, methods or intervention, and, where applicable, the form of evaluation or analysis. The main decisions are adequately justified.	The objectives are precisely formulated and fully consistent with the problem addressed. The design and methodology are rigorous, fully appropriate, and clearly described. There is excellent correspondence between the problem, objectives, design, execution, and evaluation or analysis. The information provided allows a clear assessment of the soundness of the work and, where applicable, its reproducibility or transferability.

Criteria for evaluation of submissions

Criterion	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Completely inadequate	Very poor	Insufficient	Adequate	Very good	Excellent
5. Adequate summary of results	No results are presented. In research papers, this also constitutes non-compliance with a requirement of the call for abstracts.	The results are extremely vague, incomplete, or limited to statements without data, evidence, or supporting information.	Presents some results, but they are insufficient to assess the work, are described imprecisely, or only partially address the objectives.	Presents the main results related to the objectives in an understandable way. In research, provides sufficient data; in policies, good practices, or training, presents results of implementation, evaluation, impact, lessons learned, or other relevant outcomes.	The results are clear, sufficiently complete, and relevant. They respond well to the objectives and provide specific data, evidence, or information that allow the magnitude, scope, or usefulness of the work to be assessed.	The results are presented precisely, completely, and informatively, and are directly linked to the objectives. The essential data, evidence, or information are effectively selected and clearly convey the contribution, scope, and implications of the work.
6. Consistency between results and conclusions	Conclusions are absent or incompatible with the results presented. Claims are made that the results do not support.	There is a very weak relationship between the results and the conclusions. Generalisations, inferences, or recommendations are made that are clearly unjustified given the information presented in the abstract.	The conclusions are only partially supported by the results. Some claims exceed the information available or do not adequately address the objectives.	The conclusions are reasonably derived from the results presented and address the objectives. Based on the information available in the abstract, no significant contradictions or unjustified extrapolations are observed.	There is a clear correspondence between the objectives, results, and conclusions as presented in the abstract. The interpretations and, where present, the implications or recommendations are consistent with the information provided.	There is a clear and consistent correspondence between the objectives, results, their interpretation, and the conclusions based on the information presented in the abstract. The conclusions adequately reflect the scope of the results, avoid overinterpretation, and, where applicable, raise implications that are pertinent and consistent with the information provided.

Criteria for evaluation of submissions

Criterion	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Completely inadequate	Very poor	Insufficient	Adequate	Very good	Excellent
7. Appropriateness and quality of bibliographic and/or regulatory references	No bibliographic and/or regulatory references are provided where they are necessary to support the work, or those used are clearly inadequate, incorrect, or unrelated to the content.	The references are very scarce or of little relevance and do not adequately support the main background, claims, methodology, policy, or regulatory framework of the work.	The references provide some grounding for the work, but show significant shortcomings in relevance, quality, currency, or suitability to the subject of the work.	The bibliographic and/or regulatory references are relevant and sufficient to reasonably support the work and include the main sources applicable to the issue addressed.	The references are well selected, relevant, reliable, and sufficiently up to date. They adequately support the scientific, technical, and/or regulatory framework and the main decisions or claims of the work.	The selection of bibliographic and/or regulatory references is rigorous, relevant, and of high quality. Reference sources — scientific, technical, or regulatory, current where applicable — are used, directly related to the subject of the work, and sufficient to solidly support its approach, methodology or design, and interpretation.
8. Quality of writing: clarity and linguistic correctness	The abstract is practically incomprehensible due to serious problems of writing, coherence, or linguistic correctness.	Shows numerous errors or very poor writing that significantly hinders understanding of the content. Ideas appear disorganised or disconnected.	The writing allows the general meaning to be understood, but there are frequent problems of clarity, coherence, terminology, syntax, or spelling that hinder reading.	The writing is appropriate and understandable, with a logical sequence of ideas. May show minor errors or wording that could be improved, without substantially affecting comprehension.	The writing is clear, precise, coherent, and well organised. It uses scientific, technical, or professional terminology appropriately and shows very few formal errors. Reading flows smoothly.	The writing is excellent, precise, concise, and rigorous. Ideas are presented coherently and effectively, appropriate terminology is used, and clarity is maintained despite length constraints. No noticeable spelling, grammatical, or typographical errors are present.

Annex I. Instructions for evaluating criterion 1

Language: all abstracts must be submitted and presented in Spanish, Catalan, or English.

Title: The title must be a maximum of 100 characters and in lowercase except for the first word, abbreviations, and countries. Do not use all capitals or unnecessary abbreviations. Indicate geographic location and dates if applicable.

Content: has a maximum limit of 2,000 characters (including spaces). The title, keywords, and authorship information do not count toward this limit. The system will reject abstracts that exceed the limit.

Figures and tables are not accepted.

All abstracts must follow the structure below:

1. Introduction and objectives: brief context and rationale for the work, the problem it addresses, and clearly formulated objective(s).
2. Methods: study or intervention design, population/sample, scope, variables or sources of information, procedure, and method of analysis. The submission must explain how the sex-gender perspective has been incorporated into the design and analysis.
3. Results: main results obtained, providing specific data whenever possible. Results must be real, not merely proposals for future work. When appropriate, results should be presented disaggregated by sex and possible gender differences must be analysed.
4. Conclusions: main conclusions derived from the results, their relevance to occupational health, and, where applicable, implications for prevention, professional practice, organizations, or public policy.

Authorship: each abstract may include a maximum of 5 people (authors or co-authors). It must be indicated which of the people included in the authorship will be responsible for presenting the work in person during the congress, marked with the microphone icon.

Each person may submit a maximum of 3 abstracts.

If the person originally responsible for presenting the paper or poster is unable to attend, she/he may be replaced by a co-author registered for the conference by changing this on the platform under "My contributions."

IMPORTANT: Make sure that each author has correctly completed the following information in "My Profile": first and last name, institutional affiliation (use the full official name of the institution), postal address, and email address.

Topics: All submitted works must incorporate a sex-gender perspective and address its relationship to occupational health. Authors must select at least one topic area that matches the content of the submitted abstract. If the content of the work relates to more than one topic area, it is recommended that you select a second topic area to facilitate the classification of your abstract for the congress program.

The topics to choose from are:

TOPIC 1. The impact of structural inequalities, sex, gender, and other social determinants on occupational health

This area addresses gender inequalities in the labour market and their impact on health from an intersectional and social justice perspective. Submissions could address:

- Horizontal and vertical occupational segregation
- Gendered pay gaps, job insecurity, and employment conditions and their impact on working conditions
- Feminization of poverty, career trajectories, and their impact on working conditions
- Intersections of gender, social class, migration, ethnicity, and age
- Impact on health economics
- Gendered economics perspectives on health
- Informal work and the underground economy
- Impact of labour reforms on women's health
- Adaptation of work equipment, tools, and personal protective equipment (PPE) to body diversity

TOPIC 2. Occupational risks and working conditions in feminized sectors

This area focuses on identifying, assessing, and preventing occupational risks that are invisible or undervalued in predominantly female occupations. Submissions could address:

- Musculoskeletal disorders and ergonomic risks
- Exposure to psychosocial risks
- Occupational risks in paid and unpaid domestic and care work
- Risk assessment with a gender perspective on risk prevention
- Design, implementation, and evaluation of preventive measures with a gender perspective
- Professionalization and working conditions in the care sector

TOPIC 3. Work organization, musculoskeletal disorders, and mental health

This area examines the relationship between work organization and mental health, taking into account power inequality and working conditions. Submissions could address:

- Burnout in healthcare and care professions
- Job instability, working conditions, and mental health
- Impact of gender inequalities on psychosocial and ergonomic risk factors
- Preventive psychosocial and ergonomic management with a gender perspective
- Organizational interventions to improve health with a gender perspective
- Double presence and dual burden
- Overload of unpaid care work
- Impact of public co-responsibility policies
- Time poverty

TOPIC 4. Health consequences

This area addresses the specific occupational health issues faced by women throughout the life cycle, as well as occupational risks to the reproductive health of men and women. Submissions could address:

- Reproductive health, pregnancy, breastfeeding, and occupational risks
- Reprotoxic and mutagenic substances at work and differential toxicology
- Effect of exposure to environmental toxicants on chemical sensitivity, chronic fatigue, and fibromyalgia
- Breast cancer and occupational exposure. Night shifts
- Differential impact of the hormonal cycle and menopause on exposure to occupational risks

TOPIC 5. Violence, discrimination, and regulatory frameworks

This area analyses the different forms of violence and discrimination in the workplace and their impact on health. Submissions could address:

- Sexual harassment and gender-based violence at work
- Racism, xenophobia, migrants, and multiple discriminations
- Legal frameworks and protection policies
- Institutional prevention strategies
- Implementation and evaluation of protocols against workplace violence
- Tools for addressing sexual violence in the workplace
- Organizational culture, professional isolation, discrimination dynamics, and strategies for organizational change
- Sexual violence and sex-based harassment in male-dominated work environments

TOPIC 6. Innovation, information systems, public policy, and new forms of work

This area focuses on tools for structural transformation through research and public action. Submissions could address:

- Gender-sensitive indicators in occupational health
- Health surveillance with a sex-gender perspective
- Health impact assessment of labour policies
- Design, implementation, and evaluation of public policies in occupational health with a gender perspective
- Governance and institutional coordination in mainstreaming the perspective
- Telework and work-life boundaries
- Digital platforms and precarization
- New inequalities in the face of emerging risks
- Impact of population aging on occupational health

Keywords: You must provide three keywords that match the content of your abstract. Try not to repeat the terms of the selected topics.

References: maximum of 10 references, which may be bibliographic and/or regulatory. They must follow the Vancouver style.

Type of abstract: The following types of abstracts are accepted:

- Research abstracts: works presenting results from scientific-technical studies. Research abstracts without results will not be accepted.
- Policy abstracts: analyses or proposals related to public policy, strategies, or regulatory frameworks.
- Good practice abstracts: real intervention experiences, programs, or actions in work settings with positive results.
- Training and education abstracts: training and capacity-building initiatives, programs, or methodologies.

Presentation format: You may indicate your first and second preference for presentation format. The available options are:

- 10-minute oral presentation in 60-minute sessions.
- E-poster with presentation: 5-minute digital posters in 60-minute sessions.
- E-poster without presentation: digital posters displayed throughout the conference without presentation.

The final decision on the type of presentation will be made by the scientific committee based on the score obtained in the evaluation.