ABCT 2023 Reviewer Criteria Questions-Spotlight Presentation

Spotlight Research Presentation Description: This format provides a forum to debut new findings considered to be groundbreaking or innovative for the field. A limited number of extended-format sessions consisting of a 45-minute research presentation and a 15-minute question-and-answer period allows for more in-depth presentation than is permitted by symposia or other formats.

1. SIGNIFICANCE

Please rate the <u>significance</u> 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.
N/A = This criterion does not apply to the current submission, as it is not based on research (i.e., no mention of data collection or analyses).

2. APPROACH

Please rate the quality of the adopted research <u>approach</u> (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 <u>in advance</u> 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.
N/A = This criterion does not apply to the current submission, as it is not based on research (i.e., no mention of data collection or analyses).

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.
N/A = This criterion does not apply to the current submission, as it is not based on research (i.e., no mention of data collection or analyses).

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, and/or findings have some mention of potential implications for diverse populations.
1 = Limited: Submission has limited representation of diverse populations, or sample population is not described in the submission, 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. 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, 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.

7. FIT WITH SPOTLIGHT PRESENTATION FORMAT

A spotlight presentation format provides a forum to debut new findings considered to be groundbreaking or innovative for the field. A *limited number* of extended-format sessions consisting of a 45-minute research presentation and a 15-minute question-and-answer period allows for more in-depth presentation than is permitted by symposia or other formats. Please rate the appropriateness of this presentation for the spotlight format with particular attention to the innovation of the study.

4 = Excellent: This presentation offers highly groundbreaking, innovative, and methodologically strong findings that will clearly change our field, and this presentation certainly warrants a dedicated, one-hour spotlight format.
3 = Good: This presentation offers somewhat groundbreaking or innovative findings, with strong methodology that has the potential to change our field. The presentation warrants a dedicated, one-hour spotlight format.
2 = Adequate: This presentation offers important findings; however, it is not clearly groundbreaking or innovative, or the methodology has some flaws. It is questionable whether it warrants a one-hour spotlight format.
1 = Limited: This presentation's findings are minimally groundbreaking or innovative; methodology has some flaws; or it does not warrant a one-hour spotlight format.
0 = Poor: This presentation's findings are not groundbreaking or innovative; methodology is flawed; and it does not warrant a one-hour spotlight format.