Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers for SHM Clinical Quick Talks

Elizabeth Cerceo, MD, FACP, FHM
cerceo-elizabeth@cooperhealth.edu

Busy clinical services and multiple demands on hospitalists' time make it difficult to prepare brief talks to give the residents and students. We are creating a bank of short, prepared lectures to be housed on the SHM website. These talks are designed to be succinct and given in less than 10 minutes. They are being developed for use either during teaching rounds or for a brief sit-down session in the afternoon or whenever time allows. Most talks should ideally be accompanied by a printed handout.

There is a list of topics that we will be soliciting. However, we encourage topics that may not be included on the list. This is a peer-reviewed process, and each submission will be evaluated by two to three reviewers. The author's name will appear at the top of the document and may be cited as an online publication in a curriculum vitae following formal acceptance. Reviewers' names will also be published in recognition of their contribution to the document.

1. Word documents of presentations should be limited to *one to two pages*. These will not be exhaustive reviews of a given subject but will be short, easily digestible, and presentable talks.

2. Brief power point presentations may be submitted but should include a word document and be in keeping with the goals of a talk which the clinician-educator may readily assimilate and teach. For example, the talks should be able to be reviewed and easily memorized by the hospitalist in the afternoon before going to teach the subject to their residents or students.

3. One of three formats should be used.
   a. Bullet/outline form
   b. Chart/table
   c. Algorithm/flow chart

4. Each short talk should end with a section on clinical pearls, i.e. information that is more advanced yet relevant to the clinical wards.

5. Most topics may lend themselves to a very brief case example to help illustrate the principles of the talk.

6. While there may be different levels of learners in attendance, the talks should be geared to an advanced resident.

7. Authors should plan to be responsible for the content of their talk in the future. For example, if there are major developments in the field of that talk, the authors should reflect those changes and have the materials re-submitted for revision. After two years, the materials may be removed from the website unless there is an indication from the authors that the topic remains up-to-date.

Reviewers should structure their comments to focus on content and form of the talks. Below are specific instructions for editorial reviews.

1. There should be a section of Major Comments and Minor Comments. Major Comments may include changes needed in the flow of the talk or organization of the topics. They may also reflect changes needed in the subject matter or informational content of the talk. Minor Comments may refer to smaller, more easily fixed areas for revision.

2. A suggestion should be attested to "Accept," "Accept with minor revisions," "Accept with major revisions," or "Reject."

3. Each submitted talk will be reviewed by two or three reviewers and their comments will be sent back to the author for revision.