

## Guide on the content of a scientific abstract

This guide consider and include specific element published in the call for abstract for the second international conference on public health in Africa.

### 1. size

Max 300 words (includes sub-headings but does not include the title, key words, list of authors and their addresses)

### 2. Section

Title, authors and affiliation, introduction/background, methods, results, and conclusion.

### 3. What contents

#### A. Title

The title should highlight what the study/subject is, where it was done and when it was undertaken (e.g. Cluster of COVID-19 cases in Keke district, August 2020). It should be informative but concise with no subtitles or abbreviations/acronyms and. Write the title in sentence case and only capitalize proper nouns and scientific names where appropriate (e.g., *Plasmodium falciparum*).

#### B. Authors: authors should be listed as follows:

- First author: Provide first name, initials of the middle name (if any), and the last name (e.g., Henry M. Kuku).
- Co-authors: List each co-author in order of contribution by typing their first and middle names as initials, followed by their last name in full (e.g., J.N. Toto, C.H. Kwakweri)
- Provide the organizational affiliations for all co-authors.
- Indicate the corresponding author with an Asterix\* and provide email address and telephone number plus their alternate contacts.

### C. Introduction/Background

Address clearly the scientific background (if necessary by highlighting key antecedent data or issues presented to set the stage for the study) and state briefly the rationale for the study, as well as the public health significance of the subject. Because of the anticipated diversity of the reviewers and those attending the conference, do not assume that everyone will be familiar with your topic. Explain why your study is important and what question(s) it will answer. A clearly stated background sets the stage and should include: A brief description of the topic and its public health significance, Study objectives and research questions or study hypothesis if applicable. A few criteria that reviewers might follow to evaluate this section:

- Is the public health problem or question that the study will address and its significance apparent?
- If necessary, are key antecedent data or issues presented to set the stage for the study?
- Does the author explicitly state the objective(s) of the study?
- Is the objective(s) appropriate for addressing the problem or study question?


### D. Methods

Clearly describe the methods used for the study. It usually include, the flowing essential points: design, setting, population, eligibility criteria and case definitions (if any), sample size and sampling methods, data management and analysis. For evaluation of the methods section, reviewers usually follows these questions:

- Is the overall study design adequately described?
- Is the overall study design appropriate and efficient to address the study objectives?
- Are critical definitions clearly stated (if not obvious)? These could include, for example: case, principal exposure, vaccine failure, etc. Are the epidemiological/statistical methods concisely described? Authors should avoid naming software packages instead of epidemiologic or statistical procedures.
- Is the population involved stated or apparent?
- Is the data source (questionnaire, registry, surveillance data set) stated?

### E. Results

For the results section, please present the significant findings (both positive and negative) that are directly related to the study objectives. Please always provide both absolute numbers and their percentages/proportions, rates and ratios where applicable. Please note that since an abstract is a stand-alone and citable document, the results section should contain data. It should not include such statements as 'Data will be discussed'. If considerable work is still pending before



the conference submission, please indicate that the results are preliminary. This section should not include discussion of the results. A few questions that reviewers might follow to evaluate this section:

- Do the study results logically follow the described methods?
- Are study results summarized using appropriate quantitative/qualitative measures (e.g., number of individuals in study, major time, person, and place findings)?
- Are numerical comparisons correct and appropriate (e.g. rates for explicit or implied comparisons).
- Are sufficient and adequate data presented to allow the reader to reach a conclusion?

## **F. Conclusion**

The conclusion should be as concise as possible and should include an interpretation of key findings and their implications for public health practice, public health actions that are recommended and/or have been implemented as a consequence of the study. In this section, do not re-state data included in the results. A few questions that reviewers might follow to evaluate this section:

- Are the conclusion and interpretation based on the data presented?
- Does the conclusion/interpretation address the problem and objectives?
- Does the study appear sufficiently valid and reliable to serve as a basis for the conclusions and for taking public health action (i.e. are the results unlikely to be attributable to chance, confounding, or other potential biases)?
- Is the interpretation of the findings consistent with current scientific knowledge?
- Does the author synthesize results into a conclusion (conclusions should not simply repeat data from the results or restate them with adjectives replacing numbers)?