

Appendix 10. Antibody Track Iterative Submission Abstract Scoring Criteria

Antibody Track Iterative Submission Abstract Scoring Form

Evaluation Dimension	Total Points	Content	Sub-score	Scoring Criteria	Score
Format Review	-	Format review	Pass / Fail	Whether the abstract is completed in accordance with the template requirements.	-
Content	100	Understanding and summary of first-round wet-lab results	15	12-15 points: Accurately summarizes first-round wet-lab results and identifies effective experience and main limitations of the first-round design. 6-11 points: Describes experimental results in general, but with incomplete coverage of indicators or limited summary of experience. 0-5 points: Does not sufficiently reflect understanding of the Preliminary Round experimental results or merely lists results without analysis.	
		Optimization or design direction based on Preliminary Round results	15	12-15 points: Clearly explains how model methods or candidate antibody sequence design will be optimized based on Preliminary Round results, with a clear link to experimental feedback. 6-11 points: Provides optimization directions, but the link to Preliminary Round feedback is not clear or insufficiently justified. 0-5 points: Shows no substantive optimization based on Preliminary Round results or largely repeats the first submission.	
		Use of wet-lab data	20	16-20 points: Clearly explains how first-round experimental results will be used for model training, validation, or adjustment of candidate antibody sequence screening strategies. 8-15 points: Provides a data-use plan, but the use pathway or validation approach is not sufficiently clear. 0-7 points: Does not reflect the use of experimental data or only gives a general description.	
		Algorithm model iteration	25	20-25 points: Clearly explains the main adjustments to the model, scoring function, structural constraints, multi-objective optimization strategy, candidate ranking method, or computing resource usage strategy compared with the first submission. The adjustments are clearly linked to Preliminary Round feedback and are technically feasible. 10-19 points: Describes some model or computing resource usage adjustments, but with insufficient innovation, specificity, or feasibility. 0-9 points: Largely repeats the first approach, does not show substantive iteration, or does not explain the relationship between relevant computational methods, computing resources, and candidate antibody sequence optimization.	

Evaluation Dimension	Total Points	Content	Sub-score	Scoring Criteria	Score
		Design strategy for Round 2 candidate antibody sequences	25	20-25 points: Clearly explains the sequence source, de novo design or optimization/modification approach, sequence generation or mutation design strategy, screening rules, and ranking rationale. 10-19 points: Provides a generally complete design strategy, but the screening rules, ranking rationale, or risk control are not sufficiently developed. 0-9 points: Provides insufficient rationale for candidate antibody sequence design and does not adequately support the Round 2 submission.	
Comments					