

**Society of Pediatric Psychology/Division 54  
Student Research Award Competition  
Rating Sheet**

Grant Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Rating Total:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(add ratings from 1-7 below)

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Instructions: Please provide a rating for each area listed below. The anchors are general guidelines; since a number of different types of studies will be reviewed, not all aspects of the rating descriptors will apply to every paper, but the rating may still be appropriate. If there is an aspect of the rating descriptor that does not apply, feel free to strike it out from the descriptor.

**Rating**

\_\_\_\_\_ **1. Introduction**

- 5 = Literature current, critically reviewed, introduction concise, focused, convincing, clearly stated, testable hypotheses included.
- 4 = Literature current and relevant, specific objectives identified and supported
- 3 = Literature current, theoretical/empirical position of paper generally supported
- 2 = Literature review broad, uncritically reviewed, link between introduction and objectives weak
- 1 = Literature inappropriate or important literature omitted; Minimal support for study objectives

\_\_\_\_\_ **2. Study Design**

- 5 = Design clearly linked to study hypotheses; includes appropriate comparison/controls, covariates appropriately handled in design and/or data analyses. Statistical analyses specific to hypotheses, meet major analysis assumptions. Samples unbiased, adequate in size for analysis plan.
- 4 = Design tests study hypotheses; data analyses appropriate for design, analysis assumptions (e.g., sample size, studywise error corrections) addressed.
- 3 = Design appropriate for study hypotheses; Analyses appropriate, although lacking in sophistication. Sample size adequate.
- 2 = Design not closely linked to hypotheses. Design/statistical control weak, limiting interpretability of results. Sample size adequate, but potentially biased.
- 1 = Design inappropriate for study objectives. No experimental or statistical control. Statistical analyses inappropriate, major statistical assumptions violated. Sample Size inadequate for study questions to be tested.

## **SPP/Division 54 Student Research Award Rating Sheet, Page 2**

### **3. Procedures and Measures**

- 5 = Procedures clearly described in detail permitting replication, measures selected to test specific hypotheses, rationale for measure selection is clear and supported. Procedures for insuring data integrity described and appropriate (e.g., training for observers, counterbalanced presentations, blind observations, calibration of instruments). Human subjects protections addressed.
- 4 = Procedure clearly described, rationale for measure selection provided, measures described adequately. Procedures for insuring data integrity generally addressed. Human subjects protections addressed.
- 3 = Procedure, measures described adequately. Procedure appropriate for design. Rationale for measure selection adequate. Human subjects protections addressed.
- 2 = Procedure, measures described inadequately or in confusing manner. Rationale for procedure, measures not provided. Human subjects protections inadequate or missing.
- 1 = Procedure, measures inappropriate/not related to study hypotheses. No rationale for measure selection provided Human subjects protections not addressed.

### **4. Results**

- 5 = Results reported in logical, orderly fashion. Unfamiliar analysis approaches explained; data presented in tables/figures clear, non-redundant, closely linked to text. Data presentation parsimonious, yet complete
- 4 = Results reported completely. Detail provided, but organization sometimes confusing. Tables/figures used to illustrate points made in text.
- 3 = Results reported in adequate details, generally related to hypotheses. Tables/figures sometimes redundant with text, convey excessive detail. Organization adequate.
- 2 = Results lacking in organization. Presented in haphazard fashion. Tables/figures and text not linked.
- 1 = Results inappropriately reported. Statistical analyses missing or inappropriate. Tables/figures unclear, not related to text or hypotheses.

### **5. Discussion**

- 5 = Discussion focused and logically organized; directly addresses link between hypotheses and results. Study limitations and contributions addressed, focused, and appropriate. Over-generalizations avoided; study findings interpreted in framework of previous studies.
- 4 = Discussion addresses hypotheses. Organization adequate. Study limitations discussed.
- 3 = Discussion generally addresses study results. Relationship of results to hypotheses briefly addressed. Some, but not mot, study limitations discussed.
- 2 = Discussion disorganized, fails to link results to hypotheses. Study limitations not recognized.
- 1 = Discussion not linked to study findings; data inappropriately interpreted, over-generalizations common.

## **SPP/Division 54 Student Research Award Rating Sheet, Page 3**

### **6. Style**

- 5 = Manuscript very well organized, follows parallel form from introduction to discussion; writing clear, focused, concise. APA style followed throughout.
- 4 = Manuscript generally well-organized; sections of manuscript loosely tied together. Writing clear, APA style followed throughout.
- 3 = Manuscript loosely organized. Headings used infrequently. Writing sometimes rambles, some grammatical, spelling mistakes. APA format generally followed.
- 2 = Manuscript poorly organized. Sections not linked; writing unfocused, awkward grammatically. Numerous deviations from APA format.
- 1 = Manuscript lacking in organization and clarity. APA format not generally followed.

### **7. Importance of Contribution**

- 5 = Study builds on empirical literature, adds significantly to the knowledge base. Design shows originality; creative design/procedure/measurement approach advances scientific understanding of problem. Significant contribution to pediatric psychology.
- 4 = Study builds on existing literature; adds some new information; design/procedure/measurement approach corrects flaws in previous studies. Substantial contribution to pediatric psychology.
- 3 = Study uses previous studies/models to minimally advance knowledge. Minimal new information contributed to pediatric psychology.
- 2 = Study is replication of previous research. Original contribution is lacking in both objectives and outcome. Remote contribution to pediatric psychology.
- 1 = Study largely ignores previous research. Design/procedure/measurement approach minimally contributes to knowledge base. Not related to field of pediatric psychology.

**General Comments:**