

2nd EMPHNET Conference & 5th TEPHINET Regional Scientific Conference

EVALUATION GUIDELINES

- Each abstract will be reviewed by at least three reviewers according to the following seven criteria: 1) background and rationale for study, 2) appropriateness of methods, 3) presentation of results, 4) conclusions and interpretations of results, 5) significance to public health, 6) recommended intervention and estimation of public health impact, and 7) overall clarity of abstract.
- Abstracts will be considered as candidates for either oral or author-attended poster sessions. Once an abstract is accepted, the Scientific Program Committee will determine whether it is more appropriate for oral or poster presentation.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Background and rationale for study (0-4)

- Does the background clearly state the public health problem or question the study will help to resolve?
- Are key antecedent data or issues presented to set the stage for the study?(If necessary)
- Does the background clearly state the objective(s) of the study?

2. Appropriateness of methods (0-4)

- Are epidemiologic comparisons clearly stated?
- Are critical definitions clearly stated or obvious (for example, case, principal exposure)?
- Do the selected methods correspond with the nature of study and study questions?
- Is a clear and easy-to-follow sequence of methods presented?
- Are essential methods described with precision and avoid undefined terms or jargon?

3. Presentation of results (0-4)

- Do the study results logically follow the described methods?
- Are study results appropriately summarized using quantitative terms? (for example, number of individuals in study, major time, person, and place findings)
- Are relevant comparisons made using the data?
- Are appropriate epidemiological measures used for all implied or direct comparisons?
- Are comparisons epidemiologically correct and free from fallacious interpretation? (for example, rates vs proportionate frequencies, numerical estimates of risk and impact measures vs “high” or “low”)
- Are sufficient and adequate data presented to allow the reader to reach a conclusion?
- Are the results organized in a way that assists the reader in reaching a conclusion?

4. Conclusions and interpretations of results (0-4)

- Does the conclusion have its principal basis in the data?
- Does the conclusion integrate the key results?

- Does the conclusion answer the problem and objectives stated in the background?
- Are the findings and their interpretation consistent with existing scientific knowledge?

5. Public health significance (0-4)

- Does this study, in both topic and results, have an obvious application to improving public health, and is this application obvious to the reader without the need for complex explanation or extrapolation?
- Is the study sufficiently sound (including clarity and strength of results) to serve as a basis for taking public health action?
- Do the data solve an immediate problem or build on existing knowledge (and not simply repeat what is already known)?
- Are clear criteria used to stress the public health significance of the problem under study?

6. Recommended intervention and estimation of public health impact (0-4)

- Are actions/recommendations/control measures practical, and derived directly from study results?
- Are public health actions recommended or reported as undertaken? (for example, initiating or enhancing prevention or other public health programs, developing procedures, policies or legislation, implementing and strengthening public health surveillance systems)
- Does this study actually document the potential or actual public health impact? (for example, reporting on process or outcome indicators: number of persons treated, amount of increased resources devoted to a prevention activity, evidence of improvements in the functioning of a surveillance system, estimation of morbidity or mortality prevented, or ways in which the public health actions were innovative)

7. Overall clarity of the abstract (0-4)

- Is the writing clear and brief?
- Is there a logical sequence and cohesiveness among all abstract sections?
- Are proper and simple terms used to describe methods and discuss findings?