

2024 TB Conference Abstract Review System: Rubric*

TOPICS TO BE SCORED	EXPECTED	SCORING
Relevance	The research question is relevant. The study/intervention addresses current, relevant scientific or public health issues; the study/intervention findings are important and will likely contribute to new knowledge, practice, policies or programmes	0 = not described/irrelevant 1 = minimal relevance 2 = somewhat relevant 3 = relevant 4 = very relevant 5 = extremely relevant (Weight: 1.0)
Methods/intervention or response	The study design/intervention is appropriate, given the objectives/challenges	0 = not described 1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = average 4 = above average 5 = excellent (Weight: 1.0)
Results/impacts	Results/impacts are in line with the analysis, methodology, objectives, scope, generalizability, feasibility, and robustness of findings are satisfactory	0 = not described 1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = average 4 = above average 5 = excellent (Weight: 1.0)
Clarity of the message	The study's objectives/challenges or working hypotheses are clearly stated. The text is concise and objective, the conclusions are clear and congruent with the results and the final overall messages is clear.	0 = unable to understand abstract/no conclusions 1 = very poor (i.e., Abstract is confusing. Conclusion not supported by results) 2 = poor 3 = average 4 = above average 5 = excellent (i.e., Abstract exceptionally well written. Conclusions are congruent with results) (Weight: 0.5)
Originality	The study/methodology/implementation, context and or findings are new and novel.	0 = not described 1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = average 4 = above average 5 = excellent (Weight: 0.5)

*Used by the International Union (IUATLD) and adopted for 2024 TB Conference (NAR/NTCA)