Sample Half Day Workshop

Title
Reviewer Immersion Experience through Mock Editorial and Program Committee Meetings
Carolyn E. Ievers-Landis, PhD, Rainbow Babies & Children's Hospital, Akron, OH; Diane Langkamp, MD, MPH, Akron Children’s Hospital, Akron, OH; Lee M. Pachter, DO, Nemours/AI DuPont Hospitals, Wilmington, DE; Lynne Huffman, MD, Stanford University, Stanford, CA; Susan Berger, PhD, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL; Marilisa Elrod, MD, PhD, Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, Portsmouth, VA; Benard Dreyer, MD, New York University School of Medicine, New York City, NY; Cy Nadler, PhD, Children’s Mercy Kansas City, Kansas City, MO; Katharine Zuckerman, MD, MPH, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR

Brief Description of Workshop
Developmental-behavioral pediatrics professionals from all levels and disciplines will strengthen their reviewer skills. This workshop will be led by JDBP editors and editorial board members, SDBP Research Committee co-chairs and members, and a PAS meeting liaison. Workshop leaders will summarize excellent scientific writing and describe best practices for reviewing journal manuscripts and presentation abstracts. Editors will share their experiences with manuscript reviews. In a mock editorial meeting, attendees will rate the quality of manuscript reviews and make publication recommendations. In a small group format, attendees will use an abstract review form to practice evaluating abstracts submitted for conference presentations.

Statement of Needs
The Research Committee of the Society of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics (SDBP) is sponsoring this workshop due to the great need for training in reviewing manuscripts for journals and abstracts for scientific meetings. Advances in developmental-behavioral pediatrics (DBP) are represented, in large part, by the scientific content of its journals and professional meetings. This content is reviewed, improved upon, and approved or rejected by professionals within the field as well as others in related areas of study. It is essential that SDBP members are well-trained in manuscript/abstract review so that these members can provide the highest level of oversight and assistance with the evaluation of scientific submissions. Given the inter-professional nature of DBP, it is also essential that reviewers reflect the wide-ranging perspectives of the target audiences. Journal manuscript review is an immensely important task that ensures that the science presented in journals is of high quality. Likewise, the rating of conference abstract submissions dictates what the larger scientific/medical/psychological community learns about the field’s most rigorous research and empirically validated clinical endeavors.


Goals:
1. Improve workshop attendee skills in reviewing manuscripts for scientific journals through an immersion experience of attending a mock editorial meeting.
2. Enhance workshop attendee insights into what makes reviews the most valuable for editors and for helping them make decisions about accepting or rejecting manuscripts.
3. Teach workshop attendees how to write reviews to improve both the scientific value of manuscripts as well as the way in which findings are communicated.
4. Improve attendees’ skills in reviewing abstracts for workshops/presentations/posters for scientific meetings through the immersion experience of rating mock abstracts using an abstract review form.
5. Instruct attendees in the basics of following guidelines for rating abstracts to assist in the selection of the highest quality of material for presentation at national scientific meetings.
Learning Objectives:

1. Attendees will gain additional knowledge and skills related to reviewing manuscripts for scientific journals.
2. Attendees will better understand what makes reviews valuable for editors and what is helpful for their making decisions about accepting or rejecting manuscripts.
3. Attendees will learn how to write reviews to improve the scientific value of manuscripts as well as the way in which findings are communicated.
4. Attendees will demonstrate more familiarity with best practices for reviewing abstracts for workshops/presentations/posters for scientific meetings.
5. Attendees will know more about the basics of following guidelines in rating abstracts to assist in the selection of the highest quality of material for presentation at national scientific meetings.

Workshop Agenda

Welcome and Introduction (10 minutes)
Presenter: Carolyn E. Ievers-Landis, PhD, Research Committee Co-Chair and JDBP Associate Editor

Dr. Ievers-Landis will welcome workshop attendees, introduce the workshop presenters, and provide attendees with the outline of the three-hour immersion experience in the world of editorial and program committee meetings.

Reviewing Manuscripts for Scientific Journals

Mock Editorial Meeting (1 hour)
Mock Editorial Meeting facilitators: Diane Langkamp, MD, Sue Berger, PhD, Marilisa Elrod, PhD, Benard Dreyer, MD, Cy Nadler, PhD, Katie Zuckerman, MD

Through a mock editorial meeting with individual guidance from the expert workshop presenters, attendees will rate sample reviews based on their scientific merits. Workshop attendees will be split into groups. Each group, representing a specific journal, will be comprised of a "journal editor" and two "associate editors". Attendees will guide their own experience as much as possible; a workshop presenter will be assigned to each table to facilitate the process. The "editor" will share two (mock) manuscripts that require an editorial decision about publication. Each associate editor will oversee one manuscript and the reviews of that manuscript. As a group, attendees will describe the strengths/weaknesses of each review and will use the reviews to make a recommendation for an editorial decision.

Mock Editorial Meeting panel participants: Carolyn E. Ievers-Landis, PhD, Lee Pachter, DO, Lynne Huffman, MD, Diane Langkamp, MD, Sue Berger, PhD, Marilisa Elrod, PhD, Benard Dreyer, MD, Cy Nadler, PhD, Katie Zuckerman, MD

Following each individual journal's editorial meeting, all attendees will be asked to comment to the large group about the aspects of the process that were most familiar, most surprising, and most challenging. The workshop presenters will be seated in a panel during this part of the workshop to make comments and answer questions based upon their own experiences with this process.

Editorial Insights with Q & A (20 minutes)
Presenters: Lee Pachter, DO (JDBP Editor), Lynne Huffman, MD / Carolyn E. Ievers-Landis, PhD (JDBP Associate Editors)

The JDBP Editor and two of the journal's Associate Editors will provide information as to how reviews are scored and give examples of various types of reviews. The editors will describe how to write a review that clearly describes scientific strengths and weaknesses, that addresses clarity of scientific writing, that describes strategies for improving the manuscript, and that will assist a journal editor in making a publication decision. Attendees will be encouraged to ask questions of the editors.

Break (10 minutes)
Rating Abstracts for Scientific Meetings

Introduction (15 minutes)

Presenters: Sue Berger, PhD and Benard Dreyer, MD

Drs. Berger and Dreyer will present on tips for reviewing abstracts for workshops/presentations/posters for scientific meetings using their experiences with the Pediatric Academic Societies Meeting as a prime example. They will present material regarding the importance of reviewers following standard guidelines and using an abstract review form when rating an abstract.

Mock Program Committee Meeting (45 minutes)

Mock Program Committee Meeting facilitators: Diane Langkamp, MD, Sue Berger, PhD, Marilisa Elrod, PhD, Benard Dreyer, MD, Cy Nadler, PhD, Katie Zuckerman, MD

The skills required for rating abstracts for scientific meetings will be taught by briefing attendees on the basics followed by providing hands-on practice rating mock meeting abstracts. Workshop attendees will be split into different groups, each assigned to a table. Each group will be comprised of a "program committee chair" and several "program committee members". Attendees will guide their own experience as much as possible; a workshop presenter will be assigned to each table to facilitate the process. The program committee tables will all have several (mock) abstracts to rate using an abstract review form that will be provided. Once the abstracts are rated, the "program committee chair" will work with the workshop facilitator to score them. Then the committee will discuss which abstracts should be selected as presentations and which should be selected as posters for the meeting. The issue of how well a consensus was reached will be discussed.

Mock Program Committee panel participants: Carolyn E. Ievers-Landis, PhD, Lee Pachter, DO, Lynne Huffman, MD, Diane Langkamp, MD, Sue Berger, PhD, Marilisa Elrod, PhD, Benard Dreyer, MD, Cy Nadler, PhD, Katie Zuckerman, MD

Following each individual program committee's meeting, all attendees will be asked to comment to the group about the aspects of the process that were were most familiar, most surprising, and most challenging. The workshop presenters will be seated in a panel during this part of the workshop to make comments and answer questions based upon their own experiences with this process.

Final Q & A/Discussion (20 minutes)

At the end of this immersion experience, time will be spent reviewing basic learning objectives, providing time for discussion and answering questions. A panel of all workshop presenters will be available for this portion, facilitated by Carolyn E. Ievers-Landis, PhD

Workshop panel participants: Lee Pachter, DO, Lynne Huffman, MD, Diane Langkamp, MD, Sue Berger, PhD, Marilisa Elrod, PhD, Benard Dreyer, MD, Cy Nadler, PhD, Katie Zuckerman, MD

Workshop Keywords
Clinical, Research, Education

AV Requests

Please mark your availability for presenting your workshop
Saturday Only (Saturday, September 15th from 9am-12pm)

Are you also submitting a Teaching DBP Workshop proposal?
No