**RSIG COMMITTEE GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWING ABSTRACTS**

The following criteria is used to evaluate abstracts for poster and oral presentations. Each area is rated on a 4-point scale (0=Not acceptable, 1=Acceptable, 2=Good, and 3=Excellent) for a total score of 20 points.

|  |
| --- |
| **AREAS RATED** |
| **Purpose** Is the purpose or objective of the study clearly stated? Is the *rationale* for the project made clear? |
| **Methodology** Do the authors describe the demographics of the participant adequately? Is the methodology (e.g., procedures, data analysis, and measures) described in sufficient detail? Does the experimental techniques (e.g., standardized measures, etc.) aid in addressing the key research questions and hypotheses? Did the authors use standardized measures/measures with adequate psychometric properties? For single-subject design: Is data collected on the reliability or inter-observer agreement (IOA) for each dependent variable? If employing a qualitative approach, is it described in adequate detail and is the methodology of choice appropriate for the research questions? **Results** Are the results presented in a clear, coherent fashion? Do the results verify or contradict previous findings/theories? If research is in progress, do the authors describe study progress to date or preliminary results? **Conclusions** Is the conclusion clear and understandable? Have potential limitations of the methodology been addressed? |
| **Clinical/Research Implications & Novelty** Is the information clinically important, relevant and/or significant? What are the practical implications of the information? Is this research original? |

Abstracts are anonymized (i.e., identifiers removed) by the conference committee before review to promote fairness. Please see below for an example of an abstract.

***The review process will be completed by mid-February 2023 and authors will be notified immediately thereafter by email.***