



#SRCD23 Reviewer Assignment Instructions

All reviewing will be done online. Reviewers will need to have access to the internet and be available from **October 11 through October 25, 2022**. All assignments should be completed no later than **Tuesday, October 25, 2022 (11:59 PM, EST)**. Follow the instructions below to complete your assignments.

1. Click [[here](#)] and log on.
 - If you are having issues accessing your SRCD account, please contact SRCD Membership by emailing membership@srcd.org.
2. You will be able to access the **“Biennial Meeting Submission Portal”** under the account actions in the **“Meeting Information”** section.

Account Actions

Contact Information

- ◀ Edit Profile
- ◀ Update My Demographics
- ◀ Update My Address
- ◀ Update My Contact Information
- ◀ Update My Bio
- ◀ Update My Communication Preferences
- ◀ Change Username
- ◀ Reset Password

Meeting Information

- ◀ Access Biennial Meeting Registration
- ◀ Access Biennial Meeting Online Program
- ◀ [Access Biennial Meeting Submissions Portal](#)
- ◀ Access Special Topic Meeting Submissions Portal

SRCD Resources

- ◀ Access Journals
- ◀ Access SRCD Career Center
- ◀ [Member Announcement Request Form](#)
- ◀ Make a Donation
- ◀ Pay Outstanding Orders

3. Each submission has been assigned to two reviewers. You must be finished with your reviews by **Tuesday, October 25, 2022 (11:59 PM, EST)**, so please contact your panel chairs **now** if you foresee any problems in meeting this deadline. Click [here](#) to see a complete list of the #SRCD23 Review Panel Co-Chairs.



4. Select “Review” under the Review Menu and follow the instructions to begin reviewing abstracts.

MAIN MENU LOGOUT HELP

WELCOME! You are now at the main menu.

Reviewer Menu

- Review (Review assigned submissions)

Review Status

Pending	1
Total	1

Submitter Menu

- Submit or Edit a Proposal
Submission deadline: Friday, October 2, 2020, 8:00pm EDT
- Message Center
Read messages sent from this site.

Welcome to your review assignments page. The review assignment page is broken into four sections:

- WarningMessage:** The top-most section—the white area directly below these instructions—displays your overall review status and tells you at a glance how you are doing. You will see a red warning message if you still have review assignments to complete.
- Statistics:** The second section displays a numeric breakdown of all of your review assignments letting you know how many are complete and how many are still pending.
- Tab/Filters:** The third section is used to filter which review assignments are visible. You may use the tabs to select the category of the submission. You may also choose to view only pending or completed reviews.
- Results/List of Reviews:** The bottom section lists the review assignments that match the filters you have selected. Select the appropriate link in the right-hand column to work on your review.

You have 1 review pending

Statistics

Type	Pending	Complete	Total
Individual Submission	1	0	1
Total	1	0	1

Individual Presentations Sessions

All / Pending / Complete

Showing 1 through 1 of 1 records.

Individual Presentations Search Results

#	Summary	Status	Action
1	11-Month-old visual attention predicts cognitive development at 4 years All Academic Code: 1709013	Pending	Review

5. From your main menu, click the link to review, then select a division. You will then be on your REVIEWER MENU page. You should see a list of all of your review assignment at the bottom of your review page. You can only see assignments for one division at a time. If you wish to change divisions you must click the MAIN MENU tab at the top of the page, select the review link, and then select a different division.
6. To Review a proposal, click the REVIEW link to the right of the proposal title, and then complete the review form. Required fields will be preceded by an asterisk. Be sure to complete all fields, and to make constructive comments.
7. **IMPORTANT: YOU WILL NOT BE ABLE TO MAKE CHANGES TO A REVIEW AFTER YOU HAVE MARKED IT COMPLETED.** If you feel that you may need to make changes to a review, or if you are unable to complete a review in one sitting, you should click the SAVE WORK AND FINISH LATER radio button at the bottom of the review page. Reviews that you save to finish later ARE NOT COMPLETE - they will still appear as PENDING on your Review page. You are only finished with your reviews when ALL of the items listed on your review menu are labeled COMPLETE in the status column.
8. Please contact **the SRCD Program Office** (programoffice@srcd.org) immediately if you have any technological questions or problems during the review process.



9. If you have any questions or concerns regarding submission content, please contact your [Review Panel Co-Chairs](#). For example, your Panel Co-Chairs should be contacted if you have what appear to be duplicate submissions.

Important Information:

1. **The review system is designed to be blinded for posters, papers and symposia**, so please do not seek the identity of the submitter.
2. **If you recognize the work of the submission you are reviewing and feel there is a conflict of interest**, please notify either your panel co-chairs SRCD Program Office (programoffice@srcd.org). **Do not score the submission.** *It will be reassigned to another reviewer for an unbiased review.*
3. **Brief comments about submissions regarding the significance, innovation, and design of research, etc.** may be added in the space on each proof provided for that purpose. Especially when reviewer scores differ, comments provide panel chairs with a basis for their decisions and help the program co-chairs make their final decisions. Comments will not be shared with submitters. **NOTE: once a review is submitted, it is considered final and may not be changed! You may "Save Work and Finish Later" if you intend to edit or finish a review at a later time.**
4. **Mentor-Mentee Review Pairs (Both the mentor and mentee must be current SRCD members).** Your mentee will be able to log in under their own account in order to review, but **ONLY comments and scores entered under your name will be used to rate the submission.** You may begin reviewing but be sure to click the **"Save Work and Finish Later"** button until you have collaborated with your mentee and are ready to submit the final review. **NOTE: once a review is submitted, it is considered final and may not be changed!**

Rating Considerations:

Evaluating Symposia & Group Formats (Flash Talk Symposium, Paper Symposium and Conversation Roundtables). Each symposium or group format should be rated *as a whole unit* using **Review Criteria 1-5** below. Individual paper presentations within symposia that are not accepted will not be changed to posters. The integrative statement should integrate the data and theory of the presentations, and it should be obvious how presentation abstracts relate to each other. The final grade should reflect the adequacy of the conceptualization, methods, interpretations, and importance of the symposium or group presentation as a whole. Is there coherence among the presentations? Are the individual presentations relevant to the topic of the symposium or group presentation? Are different views adequately represented?

Submissions that do not fit the usual empirical format, e.g., reviews, historical papers, policy analyses, etc., should be judged by criteria similar to these substantive ones, but excluding methodological criteria inappropriate to the format.



Review Ratings

- **5 - Excellent** High ratings on all 5 of the review criteria
- **4 - Very Good** High ratings on at least 4 of the 5 review criteria
- **3 - Good** High ratings on at least 3 of the 5 review criteria
- **2 - Fair** High ratings on at least 2 of the 5 review criteria
- **1 - Poor** High ratings on only 1 of the 5 review criteria; unacceptable science

Review Criteria

1. **Leading Edge Research, Diversity.** The SRCD strategic plan is intended to represent the future of the field as being interdisciplinary, international, attending to culture and diversity in an appropriate way, and/or having serious implications for policy. Hence, submissions with one or more of these qualities signify that they represent leading edge research that is desirable for the Biennial Meeting program.
2. **Formulation and conceptualization.** Is the purpose, question, or issue clearly delineated and linked to the empirical, historical, analytical, or theoretical significance of the work? We discourage acceptance of “promissory notes.” There must be enough empirical material in the summary, coded and analyzed— even if not yet complete—to judge the merit of a submission.
 - Poster submissions only were accepted with either a regular poster abstract or pre-registration abstract.
 - **Pre-registration Abstract:** Abstract for a study being planned to conduct (or for which data has been collected but not yet analyzed). The hypotheses & data analysis plans should be included in the submission. The abstract should state the study’s objective, describe the methods and analysis plans for each hypothesis, and discuss general implications of the study. These abstracts should also include a description of how feasible it will be for data analysis to be completed by the time of the meeting. This description should be detailed enough to enable reviewers to assess feasibility of the completion of data analysis for presentation. The data analysis should be completed before the conference to include the results and conclusion in the presentation.
3. **Methods.** The various disciplines represented in SRCD use a variety of methods. Please be particularly alert to the dangers of imposing a narrow definition of methodological adequacy that may be inappropriate in some areas. Are the methods appropriate for the question asked or the purpose undertaken? For research posters or papers, is the method clearly presented, appropriately executed, solid and replicable, logically designed, matched in scope to the question? *Descriptive case studies, single subject, and small-N designs, and other approaches are as appropriate as large group studies with statistical analyses.* Are analyses appropriate for the data? Studies with analyses in progress may be acceptable if the designs and the analyses are well conceptualized.
4. **Interpretation.** In relation to the focal question, issue, or purpose, is the interpretation appropriate? Is it justified in relation to the data and analyses, the material reviewed, or other information presented?



SRCD
Society for Research in Child Development

2023 BIENNIAL MEETING

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, USA | MARCH 23-25 | #SRCD23

5. **Importance.** Is the topic of scientific, scholarly, methodological, or theoretical importance? Is the content timely in relation to current issues or controversies? Is the content likely to be of interest to meeting attendees?

When You Have Completed Your Reviews:

Please notify your Review Panel Co-Chairs as soon as possible when you have completed reviews of all submissions assigned to you.

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for the 2023 Biennial Meeting submitted program.

