

Annex 12 - Revision of abstracts instructions

Thank you again for agreeing to review the abstracts for the annual INEBRIA Conference.

Please read this entire message carefully as it contains specific information about how to review.

Conflict of Interest Policy

These abstracts are blinded (you will not see author names or institution; each abstract is numbered and titled). Keep in mind that we have assigned abstracts randomly for review so you may recognize one as yours or that of one of your colleagues.

If you recognize an abstract as either:

- Belonging to yourself
- Belonging to a close colleague of yours
- It is an abstract that would present a conflict of interest for you to rate for any reason

Please let us know which conflict exists and do not review the abstract.

Specific Instructions

Authors were provided with the following instructions. Please have them in mind when reviewing the abstracts.

There are three abstract categories: (1) Research, (2) Program Evaluation, and (3) Experiential or Theory-Based/Generating. The main difference among the categories is in the expected content of the abstracts.

There are also abstracts that are part of symposia (that consist of 4 abstracts and a summary to be presented during a single session) and abstracts that describe workshops.

If you would like a reminder of the abstract types, see the descriptions in the attachment to this email entitled INEBRIA Submission Instructions.

Individual Abstracts and Workshops

- You will be asked to recommend individual abstracts for poster or oral presentation. To choose, please take into account the author's preference that is displayed and the format you believe would be best. In general, abstracts for oral presentation should have higher ratings (there are limited time slots) and be very clear and well organized. For workshops, confirm you recommend it as a workshop. If an abstract does not meet the criteria of quality for an oral presentation, propose poster only if the quality is somewhat ok or reject.

- Read and rate the abstract/workshop with attention to 3 criteria (that were given to submitters):
 - Clarity (interpretability)
 - Originality
 - Importance to the field of screening and brief intervention (SBI)
- For workshops, the main consideration is that they should be best suited to a format that involves small group discussion and interactive learning.
- When finished reviewing each abstract, click “send” at the bottom of the reviewer page. You will have to review a list of submissions.

Symposia

- If you have been assigned to review a symposium, you will receive all 4 of the individual abstracts associated with that symposium. Please rate Each Individual abstract AND then rate the symposium as a whole. Read further for clarity:
- You will also be asked to:
 - Rate the symposium as a whole using the full range from 1 to 5 where 1 is best (question X on the reviewer form)
 - Indicate whether the abstracts fit together well to be presented in one session, and also if the abstracts would be better presented separately as individual abstracts
- NOTE: You should not answer questions 9, 10 and 11 on the reviewer form until you have read all of the individual abstracts that comprise the symposium submission.
- We recommend that you open each abstract that is part of the symposium first, read through all four and the symposium summary, and then rate each and save each rating. You may want to print each abstract in the symposium to review side by side or simultaneously BEFORE saving. You may do this in whatever way you wish but please realize that once you save a rating you will be unable to edit your responses.
- When finished reviewing each abstract in the symposium, click “save” at the bottom of the reviewer page.

Thank you for your contributions to the abstract review process for the annual INEBRIA Conference!

Please direct any questions or concerns to: inebria@gencat.cat.