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Who is a reviewer?

What is subject to be reviewed?

Sources and library.

Content for a „Short reviewer guide“

Type of presentation for future reviewers
Who is a reviewer?

Reviewer selection by a section of the UEMS

The reviewer should be a medical specialist at least for 5 years.

Should have interest and experience in medical education.

Needs to have an (inter-) national scope on field of his/her medical specialty.

COI (see EACCME website: https://eaccme.uems.eu/home.aspx)

He/she should be able to communicate in English

A PhD title is favored
What is a conflict of interest?

• "A conflict of interest is a set of circumstances that creates a risk that professional judgement on actions regarding to primary interest will be unduly influenced by a secondary interest" (Lo B, Field MJ ed. Conflict of interest in medical research, education and practice. Institute of Medicine. National Academy of Science, Washington 2009)

• Benefit or interest can be financial, professional, institutional, social, political or ideological
Professional and personal **consequences** that might lead to potential conflict of interest in medicine.

**Personal: Do I benefit?**

**Personal financial interest**

Description: These financial interests involve a direct personal gain either in form of salary, coverage of cost, travel or dividend yield, patents or foundations.

- Any consultancy, directorship, position in or work for a commercial company that attracts regular or occasional payments in cash or in kind, both those which have been undertaken in the 12 months preceding the meeting at which the declaration is made and which are planned but have not taken place.
- Any fee-paid work commissioned by a commercial company for which the individual is paid in cash or in kind
- Any shareholdings, or other beneficial interests, in shares of a commercial company that are either held by the individual
- Funds which include investments in the commercial company that are held in a portfolio over which individuals have the ability to instruct the fund manager as to the composition of the fund.
- Educational grants

**Personal non-financial interest**

Description: This potential conflict of interest of this type may be difficult to determine as they are related to personal beliefs or convictions or loyalties.

- A clear opinion, reached as the conclusion of a research project, about the clinical and/or cost effectiveness of an intervention under review
- A public statement in which an individual has expressed a clear opinion about the matter under consideration, which could reasonably be interpreted as prejudicial to an objective interpretation of the evidence.
- Holding office in a professional organisation or advocacy group with a direct interest in the matter under consideration
- Strong political, intellectual or other commitment that may cause a conflict
- Other reputational risks in relation to an intervention under review.

**Professional: Does my organisation benefit?**

**Organisational interests that person is responsible due the position**

Description: These financial interests are linked with position or employment and person declaring is a secondary beneficiary like in institutional research grants

- Institutional positions covered by commercial funds (e.g. pharmaceutical, equipment, IT)
- Expenses and hospitality provided by a commercial company for educational purposes
- The main examples include the following: 1) fellowships, 2) a grant from a company for the running of a unit or department for which a member is responsible, 3) a grant or fellowship or other payment to sponsor a post or member of staff in the unit for which a member is responsible 4) the commissioning of research or other work by, or advice from, staff who work in a unit for which the member is responsible.
What subject is to be reviewed?

LEE

E-learning material: powerpoint courses, videos, interactive courses

„Blended“ learning

Other enduring materials; e.g. books, educational documents

Educational e-Platform

Educational e-library (or digital library):

Others: eg. apps (to be defined)
Model: Peer review
Thoughts 1

• Are peer related review activities related to reviewer bibliometrics performance?

• The Plagiarist

• Reviewer bias against the unconventional

• Reviewer status and review quality

• Who reviews the reviewers?
• Blinding and unmasking

• Editorial review is largely untested and the effects are uncertain

• Editor suggested reviewers
Bevor ein Text in einem wissenschaftlichen Journal erscheint, durchläuft er normalerweise einen mehrmonatigen Prozess, genannt »Peer Review«. Dabei prüfen Experten aus dem entsprechenden Fach den eingereichten Artikel. Raubjournal als eine Kürzung dieses Prozess oft stark ab.

**MENGE DER PUBLIKATIONEN**

Review: E Learning
EACCME CRITERIA FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF E-LEARNING MATERIALS (ELM)

UEMS 2016.21
Review: E university courses

Participant

Teacher

Diploma

Time course
Blended learning

E library
Attention given to the analysis of material
Sources and library:

- EACCME Website (technical)

- References for EACCME Reviewer Training Module (RCP) (appendix I)
  Elearning
  Blended learning
  Conflict of interest
  Live educational events (LEE)

Glossary

FAQ

„Rare „events

Feedback & Yearly update
Review of an event

- Scientific content
- Goals
- Program Definition and details
- Learners
- Responsible medical officer
- Independency from external interests
- Financial plan
Review of an event II

- Loco regional CME requirements
- Language
  - Responsibility of reviewer
  - COI
- Appeal
Personal Box: COI, personal interest, scientific believes
Usually is it advised to scrutinize mono-sponsored events, as these are often industry dependent. The issue of "independent CME providers", is delicate, and needs a thorough research into the organizer. A responsible physician needs to be identified, and it is advised to screen for possible detectable "connections" between the "Mono" sponsor and the medical officer.
Learning from the future

- Criteria for reviewers
- EACCME
- Reviewer guide
- Library
- Responsibilities
- Other criteria

Reviewer

- Review
- LEE
- eLearning Blended
- e-platform
- Library
- APP

Feedback
- Quality assurance
- Appeal
- Update Procedure