ABCT 2022 Reviewer Criteria Questions – <mark>Poster</mark>

Poster Description: One-on-one discussions between presenters, who display graphic representations of the results of their studies, and interested attendees.

1. SIGNIFICANCE

Please rate the significance of the research. Significance refers to the impact of the study on the field of cognitive-behavioral science, including scientific knowledge and clinical practice.

4 = Excellent: The research addresses a topic of critical significance, and the abstract details the importance of the study to scientific knowledge and/or clinical practice.
3 = Good: The research addresses a topic of moderate significance, and the abstract details the importance of the study to scientific knowledge and/or clinical practice.
2 = Adequate: The research addresses a topic of nominal significance, or the abstract minimally details the importance of the study to scientific knowledge and/or clinical practice.
1 = Limited: The research addresses a topic of very marginal significance, or the abstract does not detail the importance of the study to scientific knowledge and/or clinical practice.
0 = Poor: The authors did not provide an adequate explanation for the significance of the study.

2. APPROACH

Please rate the quality of the adopted research approach (including strategy, methodology, and quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods statistical analyses). Quality is the extent to which the study aims were accomplished by the selected methodology. Note that statistical analyses must be completed in advance of the meeting.

4 = Excellent: The study utilized research design and methodology that were sufficient to meet the aims, and limitations were acknowledged and minimal.
3 = Good: The study utilized research design and methodology that were generally sufficient to meet the aims, and limitations were acknowledged and noteworthy.
2 = Adequate: The study utilized research design and methodology that were generally sufficient to meet the aims, but other approaches may have been more appropriate. The limitations were nominally acknowledged and noteworthy.
1 = Limited: The study utilized research design and methodology that were insufficient to meet the aims, and limitations were noteworthy and not acknowledged.
0 = Poor: The research design was insufficient to meet the aims and had critical limitations, or it is not clear that data analyses will be completed prior to the meeting.

3. INNOVATION

Please rate the extent to which the study has the potential to shift research or clinical practice paradigms, uses novel theoretical models, approaches or procedures, mechanisms or technologies, or interventions.

4 = Excellent: Submission has excellent potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, and the research uses novel models, methods, or interventions.
3 = Good: Submission has good potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, and the research uses somewhat novel models, methods, or interventions.
2 = Adequate: Submission has modest potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, and the research uses somewhat novel models, methods, or interventions.

1 = Limited: Submission has limited potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, or the research uses very few novel models, methods, or interventions.
0 = None: Submission does not have potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, or the research does not use novel models, methods, or interventions.

4. INCLUSION OF DIVERSE POPULATIONS

Please rate the extent to which the submission is inclusive of diverse populations including traditionally underrepresented groups and individuals across the lifespan and/or presents research with clearly stated significant implications for diverse populations.

4 = Excellent: Submission clearly includes representation of diverse populations, and findings have clearly stated implications for diverse populations.
3 = Good: Submission includes diverse populations or findings have clearly stated implications for diverse populations.
2 = Adequate: Submission includes a sample that is representative of the population in that state/territory/country, which may not necessarily include diverse populations. Findings have some mention of potential implications for diverse populations.
1 = Limited: Submission has limited representation of diverse populations, and implications for diverse populations are not delineated.
0 = None: Submission does not include diverse populations, and no implications for diverse populations are stated.

5. APPROPRIATENESS TO CONVENTION THEME

Please rate the relevance of this submission to this year's convention theme: "**Emergency & Disaster Preparedness and Response: Using Cognitive and Behavioral Science to Make an Impact**." ABCT's 56th Annual Convention will spotlight research that helps us answer the question of where we are in the development of robust theory and sound science to be able to respond the public and mental health emergencies and syndemics our world is facing including but not limited to: disasters, climate change, pandemics/epidemics, systemic racism, police brutality, firearm & mass violence, homelessness, suicide & NSSI, substance use, depression, anxiety, serious mental illness, trauma, etc. Do we have the basic science to respond to these mental and public health emergencies? Do we know enough about the mechanisms of action and essential ingredients of our interventions so that we can quickly develop, adapt, and deploy cognitive and behavioral interventions to prepare and respond? Do we have the public health systems and evidence-based polices in place to recognize mental and public health emergencies and respond to them effectively? Do we have evidence-based ways to communicate the evidence for cognitive behavioral interventions to the public and policymakers to effect change? Are we equipping current and future professionals with the necessary tools to respond? We encourage submissions across the spectrum of science (i.e., basic, translational, clinical, and public policy) to effectively meet the behavioral health needs of our communities during and after mental and public health emergencies and disasters. Reviewer, please reference the call for abstracts for more information to inform your rating: https://www.abct.org/convention-ce/call-for-abstracts/

4 = Excellent: Submission is highly relevant to this year's convention theme.
3 = Good: Submission is moderately relevant to this year's convention theme.
2 = Adequate: Submission is somewhat relevant to this year's convention theme.
1 = Limited: Submission is minimally relevant to this year's convention theme.
0 = Poor: Submission appears to have no relevance to this year's convention theme.

6. RELEVANCE TO ABCT'S MISSION AND GOALS

Please rate the relevance of this submission with ABCT's mission and strategic goals. The Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies is a multidisciplinary organization committed to the enhancement of health and well-being by advancing the scientific understanding, assessment, prevention, and treatment of human problems through behavioral, cognitive, and biological evidence-based principles. ABCT's strategic plan includes the following five goals: 1) Innovation in the science of behavioral health; 2) Building relationships with members and diverse stakeholders; 3) Dissemination of CBT; 4) Public education through partnerships; and 5) Ethical delivery of science-based interventions.

4 = Excellent: Submission is particularly relevant to ABCT's mission and strategic goals.
3 = Good: Submission is moderately relevant to ABCT's mission and strategic goals.
2 = Adequate: Submission is somewhat relevant to ABCT's mission and strategic goals.
1 = Limited: Submission has minimal relevance to ABCT's mission and strategic goals.
0 = Poor: Submission appears to have no relevance to ABCT's mission and strategic goals.

7. CONTRIBUTING TEAM

Please rate the expertise of the contributing team (presenters and co-authors) based on the information provided. This can include: relevant training (formal or informal), supervision received or provided, research and scholarship (e.g., publications, presentations, community-engaged research, dissemination/implementation experience), service delivery, and teaching.

4 = Excellent: The contributing team described significant relevant experience in this area.
3 = Good: The contributing team identified relevant experience in the area for most contributors, with others having less experience but remaining qualified.
2 = Adequate: The contributing team identified some relevant experience in the area, with some of the team having less training in the specific area of interest.
1 = Limited: The contributing team did not describe relevant experiences in the area adequately for all members of the team, or the experiences described are minimally relevant.
0 = Poor: The team does not describe the relevant experiences for the submission.