REVIEWER GUIDELINES: 75-MINUTE INSTRUCTIONAL COURSE /WORKSHOP

Non-scored criteria:

If any of these criteria are not met, the abstract will be not be accepted.

1. Is the submission research or evidence based? This may include a needs assessment, outcomes or quality review for program development, preliminary or final data for an animal or human research study, needs assessment or outcomes for advocacy, etc.

2. Is there an apparent conflict of interest that was not disclosed?

3. Are there ethical concerns?

4. Does the session meet the criteria for the category in which it was submitted?

Scored Criteria:
Each abstract will be graded with a score of 0-5 for each of the below criteria:

a. Scientific merit: Is the research /program design appropriate? Do the outcomes/results align with the stated purpose/Aims of the work? For research studies, does the abstract reflect relevant reporting criteria for the study design (https://www.equator-network.org/). For program development, does the abstract include a scientific basis or outcomes for the work? For novel research approaches, is evidence provided to support the approach. For advocacy, is the need, approach or outcomes based on evidence or scientific rationale?

   5 – Exceptional- study/project design is ideally suited to research/project question
   4 – High/good quality with occasional/perceptible flaws
   3 – Moderate quality with moderate flaws
   2– Low quality but presentable
   1 – Does not meet criteria for proposed category but could be changed to another category
   0 – Should not be accepted/presented

b. Innovation: Does the abstract reflect a novel approach or propose a shift in the current research approach, clinical practice or area of advocacy? Does it reflect recent innovations?
   5 – Highly innovative and novel
   4 – Moderate-highly innovative
   3 – Moderately innovative
   2 – Low in innovation but presentable
   1 – Does not meet criteria for proposed category but could be changed to another category
   0 – Should not be accepted/presented

c. Contribution to the field: Is the problem or challenge discussed of high impact and importance to the field and individuals living with spinal cord injury?
   5 – High impact work with the potential to improve the lives of individuals living with SCI in areas of high priority
   4 – Moderate-high impact
   3 – Moderate impact
   2 – Low impact but presentable
   1 – Does not meet criteria for proposed category but could be changed to another category
   0 – Should not be accepted/presented