ABCT 2023 Reviewer Criteria Questions - Panels

Panels Description: Discussions (or debates) by a range of informed individuals (e.g., researchers, clinicians, community stakeholders, consumers) on a current important topic that is conceptual in nature, rather than pertaining directly to clinical care. Examples of topics for panel discussions include (but are not limited to): supervision/training issues, ethical considerations in treatment or training, the use of technology in treatment, cultural considerations in the application of CBTs, among others. These are organized by a moderator and include between 3-5 panelists with a range of experiences and attitudes. The total number of speakers may not exceed 7.

1. SIGNIFICANCE

Please rate the significance of the topic. Significance refers to the impact of the conceptual topic being discussed on the field of cognitive-behavioral science, including scientific knowledge, clinical practice, training/supervision, and broader community impact.

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

2. APPROACH

Please rate the quality of evidence provided in the abstract to support the proposed topic of discussion (Note: Evidence can be in the form of randomized trials, open trials, feasibility or acceptability studies, mixed-methods approaches, program evaluation, etc.). Please base evaluations on *what evidence is provided*, not what evidence the reviewer is aware of.

4 = Excellent: The quality of the evidence to support the proposed topic of discussion is excellent.
3 = Good: The quality of the evidence to support the proposed topic of discussion is good.
2 = Adequate: The quality of the evidence to support the proposed topic of discussion is adequate.
1 = Limited: The quality of the evidence to support the proposed topic of discussion is limited.
0 = Poor: The quality of the evidence to support the proposed topic of discussion is poor.

3. INNOVATION

Please rate the extent to which the panel discusses a topic with the potential to shift research or clinical practice paradigms, introduces novel theoretical models, approaches or procedures,

mechanisms, technologies, interventions, ethical considerations, cultural considerations, collaboration considerations, or sheds light on an innovative concept that has the potential to impact our field.

4 = Excellent: Submission has excellent potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, and the panel presents important and novel models, methods, interventions, concepts.
3 = Good: Submission has good potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, and the panel uses somewhat novel models, methods, or interventions.
2 = Adequate: Submission has modest potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, and the panel uses somewhat novel models, methods, or interventions.
1 = Limited: Submission has limited potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, or the panel uses very few novel models, methods, or interventions.
0 = None: Submission does not have potential to shift research or clinical paradigms, or the panel does not use novel models, methods, or interventions.

4. INCLUSION OF DIVERSE POPULATIONS

Please rate the extent to which the panel addresses a topic related to diverse populations including traditionally underrepresented groups and individuals across the lifespan and/or presents a topic with clearly stated implications for diverse populations.

4 = Excellent: Submission clearly addresses a topic related to diverse populations, and/or presents a topic with clearly stated implications for diverse populations.
3 = Good: Submission moderately addresses a topic related to diverse populations, and/or presents a topic with moderately stated implications for diverse populations.
2 = Adequate: Submission nominally addresses a topic related to diverse populations, and/or presents a topic with nominally stated implications for diverse populations.
1 = Limited: Submission marginally addresses a topic related to diverse populations, and/or presents a topic with marginally stated implications for diverse populations.
0 = None: Submission does not address a topic related to diverse populations, and does not present a topic with clearly stated implications for diverse populations.

5. 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.

6. 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, teaching and inclusion of a diverse range of informed individuals who can speak about the topic from diverse perspectives including researchers, clinicians, community stakeholders, consumers.

4 = Excellent: The contributing team described significant relevant experience in the proposed topic and includes representation of a diverse range of informed individuals including researchers, clinicians, community stakeholders, consumers who can speak about the topic from diverse perspectives.

3 = Good: The contributing team identified relevant experience in the area for most contributors, with others having less experience, but remaining qualified. The team is moderately representative of a diverse range of informed individuals who can speak about the topic from diverse perspectives.

2 = Adequate: The contributing team identified nominally relevant experience in the area, with some contributors having less experience in the specific area of interest. The team is marginally representative of a diverse range of informed individuals who can speak about the topic from diverse perspectives.

1 = Limited: The contributing team identified marginally relevant experience in the area. The team is marginally representative of a diverse range of informed individuals who can speak about the topic from diverse perspectives.

0 = Poor: The team does not describe the relevant experiences for the submission and is not representative of a diverse range of informed individuals who can speak about the topic from diverse perspectives.