



## **SGIM Regional Peer Review Rubrics**

**Clinical Vignettes**

**Scientific Abstracts**

**Innovations**

**Workshops**

Thank you for volunteering to peer review submissions for the Annual Meeting. Your thoughtful review and scoring will ensure SGIM provides quality peer-reviewed content at the Regional Meeting. You should use the following rubrics to guide your scoring.

\*\*Prior to starting this evaluation please take a moment to consider the intent of this activity and refrain from basing answers on personal attributes or other factors that would result in biased scores. Gender and race bias is a serious issue and one that is often evident on evaluations. Your scores and suggestions should be on the technical aspects of the presentation.\*\*

# CLINICAL VIGNETTE PEER REVIEW RUBRIC



**Important Clinical Problem** *To what extent does the abstract illustrate an important clinical problem(s) commonly encountered by internists, such as diagnostic, therapeutic, or management dilemma?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Does not illustrate an important clinical problem(s) to general internists	Illustrates a clinical problem(s) of <i>little importance</i> to general internists	Illustrates a clinical problem(s) of <i>some importance</i> to general internists	Illustrates an important clinical problem(s) of <i>average importance</i> to general internists	Illustrates an important clinical problem(s) of <i>moderate importance</i> to general internists	Illustrates an important clinical problem(s) of <i>significant importance</i> to general internists	Illustrates an important clinical problem(s) of <i>extreme importance</i> to general internists

**Insight into Clinical Practice, Education or Research** *To what extent does the abstract provide insight into clinical practice, education or research in either outpatient or hospital settings?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides no insight into clinical practice, education or research	Provides a <i>little insight</i> into clinical practice, education or research	Provides <i>some insight</i> into clinical practice, education or research	Provides <i>adequate insight</i> into clinical practice, education or research	Provides <i>considerable insight</i> into clinical practice, education or research	Provides <i>significant insight</i> into clinical practice, education or research	Provides <i>complete insight</i> into clinical practice, education or research

**Relevance to General Internal Medicine** *To what extent does the abstract offer a diagnosis, physical examination or management pearl that is important to general internists?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Does not offer a diagnosis, physical exam or management pearl that is important to general internists	Important to only a few general internists	Important to some general internists	Important to about half of general internists	Important to many general internists	Important to many general internists and expands current concepts	Important to most all general internists and greatly expands current concepts

**Discussion of Relevant Literature** *To what extent does the abstract include a discussion of relevant literature, as if submitting the vignette for peer-reviewed publication?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides no discussion of relevant literature	Provides a little discussion of relevant literature	Provides some discussion of relevant literature	Provides adequate discussion of relevant literature	Provides above average discussion of relevant literature	Provides substantial discussion of relevant literature	Provides complete discussion of relevant literature

**Quality of Writing** *Is the writing clear and organized to effectively communicate findings?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Writing is poor and disorganized	Writing is adequate and somewhat disorganized	Writing is adequate and minimally disorganized	Writing is clear and organized	Writing is above average and organized	Writing is high quality and well organized	Writing is outstanding quality and very well organized

# SCIENTIFIC ABSTRACT PEER REVIEW RUBRIC



**Importance of the Research Question:** To what extent does the abstract address a topic that is important? To what degree will the results advance concepts in General Internal Medicine?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Does <i>not</i> address a topic important to general internists.	Addresses a topic important to only a <i>few</i> general internists.	Addresses a topic important to <i>some</i> general internists.	Addresses a topic important to about <i>half</i> of general internists.	Addresses a topic that is important to <i>many</i> general internists; or <i>somewhat</i> expands current concepts.	Addresses a topic that is important to <i>most</i> general internists; or <i>greatly</i> expands current concepts.	Addresses a topic important to <i>nearly all</i> general internists; or introduces a <i>new</i> concept.

**Strength and Appropriateness of Methods:** Is the study design clearly described? Are sampling procedures adequately described, including inclusion and exclusion criteria; is there potential selection bias? Are the measures reliable and valid? Are possible confounding factors addressed? Are the statistical analyses appropriate for the study design, and are they the best that could have been used? Is there discussion of the statistical power?

*[Please note that not all issues described apply to all abstract types. For example, qualitative studies may not have statistical analyses; however, they should still be evaluated on the quality of study design description and appropriateness of the methods.]*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Study design and sampling procedures <i>not</i> described. Possible confounders <i>not</i> discussed. Statistical analyses are <i>not</i> discussed.	Study design and sampling procedures <i>poorly</i> described. Possible confounders <i>not</i> discussed. Statistical analyses are <i>not</i> appropriate.	Study design and sampling procedures <i>adequately</i> described. Possible confounders <i>not</i> discussed. Statistical analyses are <i>adequate</i> .	Study design and sampling procedures <i>fully</i> described. Measures are <i>probably</i> reliable and valid. Possible confounders <i>partially</i> discussed, but may not be controlled. Statistical analyses are <i>appropriate</i> .	Study design and sampling procedures <i>fully</i> described. No selection bias exists. Measures <i>probably</i> reliable and valid. Possible confounders <i>fully</i> discussed and controlled for as needed. Statistical analyses are <i>appropriate</i> .	Study design and sampling procedures <i>well</i> described. No selection bias exists. Measures <i>are</i> reliable and valid. Possible confounders <i>fully</i> discussed and controlled for as needed. Statistical analyses are <i>strong</i> .	Study design and sampling procedures <i>very clearly</i> described. No selection bias exists. Measures <i>are</i> reliable and valid. Possible confounders <i>fully</i> discussed and controlled for as needed. Statistical analyses are the <i>best that could have been used</i> .

**Validity of Conclusions and Implications:** Are conclusions clearly stated and justified by the data? Are implications strong enough to influence how clinicians/teachers/researchers “act” in clinical practice, teaching, or future research?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conclusions and implications <i>not</i> included. Does <i>not</i> influence action.	Conclusions <i>present</i> but not justified. Does <i>not</i> influence action.	Conclusions <i>present</i> and <i>weakly</i> supported. Provides knowledge but <i>likely will not</i> change action.	Conclusions <i>clearly</i> stated and <i>supported</i> . <i>Absent or weak</i> implications. Provides knowledge but <i>likely will not</i> change action.	Conclusions <i>clearly</i> stated and supported. Implications <i>weak</i> . Provides knowledge that <i>may</i> change action.	Conclusions <i>clearly</i> stated and supported. Implications <i>moderately</i> appropriate. Provides knowledge that <i>may</i> change action.	Conclusions <i>clearly</i> stated and supported. Implications <i>fully</i> appropriate. Provides knowledge that <i>likely will</i> change action.

**Quality of Writing:** Is the writing clear and organized to effectively communicate findings?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Writing is <i>poor</i> and <i>disorganized</i> .	Writing is <i>adequate</i> and <i>somewhat</i> disorganized.	Writing is <i>adequate</i> and <i>minimally</i> disorganized.	Writing is <i>clear</i> and <i>organized</i> .	Writing is <i>above average</i> and <i>organized</i> .	Writing is <i>high quality</i> and <i>well</i> organized.	Writing is <i>masterful</i> and <i>well</i> organized.

# INNOVATIONS PEER REVIEW RUBRIC



**Goals/Importance** Is this topic clearly stated, important and relevant to the practice of GIM? Does it fill an unmet need, would implementation lead to an improvement for the target audience?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Rarely relevant/important to GIM Practice		Sometimes relevant/important to GIM		Usually relevant/important to GIM Practice		Critically relevant/important to GIM

**Methods** Is the intervention well described? Are teaching method(s) appropriate to meet defined objectives? Are assessment measures adequate to evaluate outcomes? For technology-enhanced innovations, is the technology appropriate for the objectives, implemented effectively, and user-friendly?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unable to adequately determine methods		Methods are discernible		Methods are clear, appropriate for goals, adequate to attain evaluation		Methods use a gold standard or create one that can be replicated

**Innovation** Is this work truly innovative, i.e. do authors show that it is a novel concept, or an implementation not done elsewhere? Does it fill an unmet need?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Duplicates other efforts/studies		Some aspects of approach are original, others duplicate other efforts/studies		Overall original concept approach, innovative or unmet need		Strikingly novel approach or innovation, may fill gaps that may yet be unrealized in medical practice

**Impact** Is it more than an adaptation to local needs? Is the innovation feasible elsewhere? Does the abstract convey how the innovation can be implemented? Is there reflection on lessons learned, and what may be valuable to others?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unlikely to be useful/applicable beyond studied institution		Possibly of use to others, implementation might be feasible at other sites		Easily implementable and feasible to translate to other sites		Easy to adapt to other sites; high positive impact for invested resources

# WORKSHOP PEER REVIEW RUBRIC



## Learning Objectives To what extent are the learning objectives clearly stated and measurable?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The learning objectives and the presentation proposal do not align		The learning objectives and presentation proposal somewhat aligned and not easily measurable or generalizable		The learning objectives and presentation proposal well aligned and moderately measurable or generalizable		The learning objectives and presentation proposal clearly aligned, easily applicable /generalizable and have identified measurable outcomes

## Method of Teaching To what extent do the method of teaching and outline of session match the stated learning objectives?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not outlined well		Outlined but the time allocation not appropriate		Well outlined Practical and meaningful demonstration of objectives		Stimulates active audience interaction Promotes immediate call to action. Practical and meaningful demonstration of objectives. Has collaboration across institutions

## Likely to Engage How likely is this session to enhance clinical, research, or educational behaviors of the session attendees?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not likely to enhance all/or either clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information		Somewhat likely to enhance all/or either clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information		Very likely to enhance all/or either clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information		Definitely likely to enhance all/or either clinical, research or educational behaviors with novel information

## OPTIONAL: Relation to Meeting Theme - How closely does this submission relate to the meeting theme or SGIM strategic priorities?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unrelated to either		Somewhat related to meeting theme or strategic priorities		Mostly related to theme or strategic priorities		Directly related to theme or strategic priorities