**SIGNIFICANCE (Panel Discussion)**

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 a 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.

**APPROACH (Panel Discussion)**

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.

**INNOVATION (Panel Discussion)**

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.

**INCLUSION OF DIVERSE POPULATIONS (Panel Discussion)**

Please rate the extent to which the panel discussion 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.

**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.

**CONTRIBUTING TEAM (Panel Discussion) 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.