**SIGNIFICANCE (Clinical Round Table)**

Please rate the significance of the topic. Significance refers to the impact of the topic being discussed on patient care, treatment, and/or the application/implementation of a treatment.

4 = Excellent: The clinical round table addresses a topic of critical significance, and the abstract clearly details the importance of the topic to patient care, treatment, and/or the application/implementation of a treatment.

3 = Good: The clinical round table addresses a topic of moderate significance, and the abstract moderately details the importance of the topic to patient care, treatment, and/or the application/implementation of a treatment.

2 = Adequate: The clinical round table addresses a topic of nominal significance, and the abstract marginally details the importance of the topic to patient care, treatment, and/or the application/implementation of a treatment.

1 = Limited: The clinical round table addresses a topic of marginal significance, and the abstract does not detail the importance of the topic to patient care, treatment, and/or the application/implementation of a treatment.

0 = Poor: The authors did not provide an adequate explanation for the significance of the clinical round table.

**APPROACH (Clinical Round Table)**

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 trails, 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.

**INNOVATION (Clinical Round Table)**

Please rate the extent to which the clinical round table discusses a topic with the potential to impact patient care, treatment, and/or the application or implementation of a treatment/practice in a community setting.

4 = Excellent: Submission has excellent potential to impact care, treatment, and/or the application or implementation of a treatment/practice in a community setting.

3 = Good: Submission has good potential to impact care, treatment, and/or the application or implementation of a treatment/practice in a community setting.

2 = Adequate: Submission has modest potential to impact care, treatment, and/or the application or implementation of a treatment/practice in a community setting.

1 = Limited: Submission has limited potential to impact care, treatment, and/or the application or implementation of a treatment/practice in a community setting.

0 = None: Submission does not have potential to impact care, treatment, and/or the application or implementation of a treatment/practice in a community setting.

**INCLUSION OF DIVERSE POPULATIONS (Clinical Round Table)**

Please rate the extent to which the clinical round table 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.

1 = Submission clearly includes representation of diverse populations and findings have clearly stated implications for diverse populations.

0 = Submission has limited or no representation of diverse populations, or sample population is not described in the submission, and implications for diverse populations are not delineated.

**CONTRIBUTING TEAM (Clinical Round Table) Responses will not be included in overall ratings score.**

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.

2 = Excellent: The contributing team described significant relevant expertise and experience in this area.

1 = Limited: The contributing team identified relevant experience in the area for most contributors, with others having less experience but remaining qualified.

0 = 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.

**RELEVANCE TO ABCT'S MISSION AND GOALS (ALL Submission Types)**

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.