John R. Walker Clinical Research Award

**Rating Guideline**

**Award Criteria**: evidence of scholarly achievement (a minimum GPA of 3.5) and scientific achievement (first authorship on a peer reviewed journal article, book chapter, or conference presentation) in the previous calendar year (e.g., the 2024 award will be for a 2023 publication).

**Criterion 1: Quality of Publication Venue**

The DCT will provide a score for the journal the manuscript is published in, ranging from 1 to 5, taking into consideration: (a) rank of the journal within the field, such as 12th ranked journal out of 140 in clinical psychology, and (b) impact factor – with the former receiving greater weight:

**1:** A low-ranked journal in the field (e.g., 120/137 in clinical psych) with a lower impact factor

**2:**

**3**: A median-ranked journal in the field (e.g., 70/137 in clinical psych) with a medium impact factor

**4:**

**5:** One of the top journals in the field (e.g., 9/137 in clinical psych), with a higher impact factor

**Criterion 2: Student role and contributions to the research**

We recognize that student first-authored manuscripts still require significant input and mentorship from a senior scientist. Students with higher scores on this criterion have taken on more responsibility for key components of the study design, analysis, and write-up. This score is computed by the DCT based on student self-evaluation in cover letter of relative contributions to: (a) idea conception and study design, (b) data collection, (c) data analysis, and (d) manuscript writing. The total score out of 10 is an average of these 4 self-evaluations, with *projects in which the student did not collect data receiving a 10% deduction (i.e., the average of a, c, and d minus 10%).* The supervising mentor on this project will be emailed to confirm the self-evaluation.

**Criterion 3: Quality of the research**

Raters are encouraged to use the full scale in order to increase variance among applicants. When deciding on ratings, raters will consider the degree to which the manuscript is: (a) original/innovative/significant, and (b) scientifically rigorous in terms of its design and analysis.

**0.0-3.3** = a relatively weaker publication that is not particularly original and innovative, and that doesn’t have clear theoretical or practical significance. Manuscripts in this range normally have weaker designs (e.g., correlational) and simple analyses.

**3.4-6.6** = publications in this range might have both: (a) moderate originality/innovation/significance and (b) moderately strong design and analysis, or they might be very strong in one area (e.g., highly innovative) and weaker in another (e.g., weak design or analysis).

**6.7-10** = a very high-quality manuscript that is clearly original and innovative, and that has obvious theoretical or practical significance. Manuscripts in this range also typically have strong experimental or longitudinal designs, and complex/sophisticated analyses.

**Criterion 4: Quality of the writing**

Raters will provide a score, ranging from 0-10, using full range of the following scale. Raters will take into consideration the: (a) **content of the writing** (e.g., is the problem clearly stated, are the contributions and the objectives clearly stated, is the literature review thorough and balanced, is the take-home message clear), (b) **style of the writing** (is the paper logical and well-organized, are sentences clear and concise, are there transitions between paragraphs, is jargon avoided), and (c) **language and grammar** (is wording precise and simple, is the writing mostly active versus passive, are there grammar issues, is there biased language).

**0.0-3.3** = a poorly-written manuscript in terms of content, style, and language.

**3.4-6.6** = manuscripts in this range are generally well-written, although they are lacking in terms of content, style, or language/grammar

**6.7-10** = an extremely well-written manuscript that is clear, organized, and uses strong language to convey the research findings

\* Based largely on points raised in Ch. 6 of Sternberg, R. J. & Sternberg, K. (2010). *The psychologist’s companion: A guide to writing scientific papers for students and researchers* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.