

### Unsuitable for Further Consideration

Please do not accept any submissions for any category if they do not meet any of the below criteria. Indicate this by scoring all fields as “0” and providing a reason for your decision in the comments section.

1. The submission does not include evidence, original research and/or does not describe a novel initiative/programme.
2. There is an apparent conflict of interest that has not been disclosed.
3. There are ethical concerns.

Please grade each abstract with a score (scale of 1-5) for each of the below criteria:

## 75-minute Instructional Course/Workshop

In depth overview of recent research evidence and/or translation into clinical practice of an innovative, evidence-based topic. The session needs to include 3-5 presenters and must include at least 15 minutes for discussion, preferably interspersed throughout the session. Please score all categories as zero if there are more than 5 presenters (and explain in the comments box). Proposals that are interdisciplinary and involve presenters from a range of institutions, countries and academic rank are encouraged. Very few 75-minute sessions will be accepted. Only award a high grade (4-5/5 average) for, at the most, half of the 75-minute sessions assigned to you

- a. **Scientific Merit:** Is the research /programme 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 programme 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– should not be accepted/presented
  - 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