**SIGNIFICANCE (Spotlight Research)**

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.

**APPROACH (Spotlight Research)**

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 (Spotlight Research)**

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.

**INCLUSION OF DIVERSE POPULATIONS (Spotlight Research)**

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.

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.

**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.

**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 (Spotlight Research)** **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.