



ANC 2024/ANEC IX

9TH AFRICA NUTRITION CONFERENCE

Date: 7-11 October, 2024
Venue: University of Cape Coast – North Campus
Cape Coast, Ghana

African Nutrition Society & Ghana
Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics,
P.O. Box K18, Korle Bu,
Accra, Ghana.
DATE: 07/04/2024

GUIDELINES FOR ABSTRACT REVIEW PROCESS

The abstract is a scientific document of original work and requires peer review to meet standards required for dissemination. Your work as a reviewer is highly valued. Your expertise in scrutinizing abstracts to ensure their quality and appropriateness is much appreciated.

In reviewing the abstracts, you need to note, assess and ensure the following:

1 Relevance and word Limit (Max 300): How relevant is the abstract to the conference and does the abstract fall within the prescribed word limit?

Score: Poor  Fully Meets

Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

2 Title, Background and objectives: Are the title, background and objectives well presented, clear and sound?

Score: Poor  Fully Meets

Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

3 Originality: Is the work being presented novel? Does it provide new insights into existing problems or issues? Has the work been previously presented in the same format elsewhere, and if so, why is it being presented again?

Score: Poor  Fully Meets

Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

4 Structure: Does the abstract follow the format provided in the instructions to authors? Has it got a clear structure including title, background, aims/objectives, methodology/study design, results, conclusion and keywords?

Score: Poor  Fully Meets

Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

5 If the type of study does not lend itself to the above, is the structure logical, clear and sound?

Score: Poor ←————→ Fully Meets
Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

6 Does the content of the abstract reflect the title and is the language (grammar and comprehension) good and appropriate?

Score: Poor ←————→ Fully Meets
Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

7 Methods / Study Design: Are these clearly presented, and the methods sufficiently described including sampling and subject recruitment (where applicable)?

Score: Poor ←————→ Fully Meets
Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

8 Data Collection, collation and analysis: How sound are the methods for collecting and analyzing data? Are the methods of data analysis clear and appropriate?

Score: Poor ←————→ Fully Meets
Criteria

0		1	2	3
---	--	---	---	---

9 Results: How well have these been presented? Is it concise, clear, logical, informative and accurate?

Score: Poor ←————→ Fully Meets
Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

10 Conclusion: How sound are the deductions and conclusions from the results? Are they justified and supported by the results presented?

Score: Poor ←————→ Fully Meets
Criteria

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

Each criterion will be given a score between 0 and 3 as follows:

- 0 = poor
- 1 = satisfactory
- 2 = good
- 3 = fully meets criteria
- **Max score 30 = 100%**
- **Min score 0 = 0%**

NOTE TO REVIEWERS

Acceptance or rejection of an abstract will be based on their overall score. The minimum score required for acceptance is 18 points (or 60%). Abstracts scoring ≥ 24 ($\geq 80\%$) will be allocated to oral presentation until the slots are filled or unless the author prefers a poster presentation. All other eligible abstracts will be accepted for Poster presentations.

For abstracts receiving between 15.0 (50% and 17.9 (59%) points, authors may be given a timeframe within which to improve and re-submit their abstracts for assessment.

NB: Return evaluation form and the reviewed abstract after evaluation. The abstract would be returned to the authors to include suggestions by the reviewer before publication in the e-book of abstract if accepted.

ANC 2024 (ANEC IX) ABSTRACT REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

Reviewer's Name :		
Abstract N^o		
Title:		
Presenting author.		
ABSTRACT REVIEW	SCORE 3 = Excellent 2 = Good	COMMENTS 1 = Fair 0 = Poor
1. Relevance and word Limit (Max 300): How relevant is the abstract to the conference and does the abstract fall within the prescribed word limit?		
2. Title, Background and objectives: Are the title, background and objectives well presented, clear and sound?		
3. Originality: Is the work being presented novel? Does it provide new insights into existing problems or issues? Has the work been previously presented in the same format elsewhere, and if so, why is it being presented again?		
4. Structure: Does the abstract follow the format provided in the instructions to authors? Has it got a clear structure including title, background, aims/objectives, methodology/study design, results, conclusion and keywords?		
5. If the type of study does not lend itself to the above, is the structure logical, clear and sound?		

6. Does the content of the abstract reflect the title and is the language (grammar and comprehension) good and appropriate?		
7. Methods / Study Design: Are these clearly presented, and the methods sufficiently described including sampling and subject recruitment (where applicable)?		
8. Data Collection, collation and analysis: How sound are the methods for collecting and analyzing data? Are the methods of data analysis clear and appropriate?		
9. Results: How well have these been presented? Is it concise, clear, logical, informative and accurate?		
10. Conclusion: How sound are the deductions and conclusions from the results? Are they justified and supported by the results presented?		
TOTAL SCORE (/30)		
	Response 1 = Oral 2 = Poster 3 = Discarded fully	
FINAL DECISION		