

## Instructions for CME

### Overview

The process of reviewing submissions for publication requires specific skills and knowledge, both as a reviewer and in the content area of the submission itself. Engaging in the review process may require the reviewer to learn new skills or fortify existing expertise in order to complete the review process effectively.

As stated in the [MedEdPORTAL Reviewer Expectations](#) reviewers should not review a submission if they do not think that they are competent to assess the content described, they believe there is a conflict of interest that might bias their assessment of the submission, or there is any other situation that could bias their view.

### Educational Objectives

By participating in this *MedEdPORTAL* submission review, the reviewer should be able to:

1. Apply established criteria used to assess educational scholarship.
2. Improve their ability to critically appraise educational scholarship within their area of expertise.
3. Increase understanding of educational principles in a way that informs their practice and teaching.

### Earning Credit

To earn credit, reviewers need to answer the following 4 questions at the end of the peer review form:

1. Are you interested in earning continuing education credit? (Choose YES - *AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™* or NO)
2. How long did it take to complete this review? (Select the applicable time frame.)
3. Performing this review has improved my ability to critically appraise educational scholarship within my area of expertise. (YES or NO)
4. Performing this review has improved my understanding of educational principles in a way that informs my practice and teaching. (YES or NO)

*All questions must be answered to earn the credit.*

The journal's editor will evaluate your review and assign a score between 1 and 5 to reflect the quality of the review. A score of 3 or above is needed in order to earn credit. Please note that the evaluation of a review is independent of the quality of the article. Even if a reviewer recommends against publishing the article, credit can be awarded if the quality of the review scores a 3 or above.

### Evaluation & Certificates

At the end of each year (December 31) *MedEdPORTAL* editors will download a report from Editorial Manager which includes all reviews from that year and the associated score.

All reviewers who have earned a score of 3 or above on at least one review will receive an email at the end of year with a link to the CME California website (our vendor for credits and certificates) where they can claim and print their CME certificates. All credits for the year (maximum of 15 credits) will be awarded on **one certificate** and the website will remain open for 4 weeks. For more information please visit:

<http://cpd.ucsd.edu/AAMCManuscript>

In accordance with provider guidelines, physicians (MDs and DOs) will earn 3 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credit*<sup>™</sup> credits for each review. Be sure that you have indicated MD or DO in the degree field of your Editorial Manager profile.

#### Accreditation

This activity has been planned and implemented in accordance with the accreditation requirements and policies of the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) through the joint providership of the University of California San Diego School of Medicine and the Association of American Medical Colleges. The University of California San Diego School of Medicine is accredited by the ACCME to provide continuing medical education for physicians.

The University of California San Diego School of Medicine designates this manuscript review activity for a maximum of **3.0 AMA PRA Category 1 Credits**<sup>™</sup>. Physicians should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Note: a reviewer may claim a maximum of up to 15.0 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credit*<sup>™</sup> per year for submission reviews through *MedEdPORTAL: The Journal of Teaching and Learning Resources*.

#### Disclosure of Relevant Financial Relationships

It is the policy of University of California San Diego Continuing Medical Education to ensure that the content of accredited continuing education and related materials is accurate, balanced, objective, and scientifically justified. Education must be free of the influence or control of ineligible companies, and protect learners from promotion, marketing, and commercial bias. All persons in a position to control the content of accredited continuing education must disclose all financial relationships held with ineligible companies, prior to assuming a role in the activity. Those relationships deemed relevant to the education are mitigated prior to the activity through one of the following strategies: 1) divesting the financial relationship, 2) altering the individual's control over content, and/or 3) validating the content through independent peer review. Persons who refuse or fail to disclose are disqualified from participating in the activity. Activities are evaluated by participants and peer reviewers to determine if the content was free of bias and met acceptable scientific standards. This information is considered in future activity planning.

Persons in control of content of this educational activity, such as course directors, faculty, CME staff, planners, editorial staff, peer reviewers, and CME committee reviewers do not have any relevant financial relationships.

This educational activity may contain discussion of unlabeled and/or investigational uses of agents that are not approved by the FDA. Please consult the prescribing information for each product. The views and opinions expressed in this activity are those of the faculty and do not necessarily reflect the views of the University of California San Diego School of Medicine.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### 1. What are the criteria for scoring a review?

As described in the [Reviewer Expectations](#), the most helpful reviews are typically three or more paragraphs in length and include the following: (1) a brief resource summary with an indication of how the submission contributes to the field, (2) identification of strengths and weaknesses in the ESR and appendices with specific recommended revisions, and (3) a strong case for the selected editorial recommendation.

From these guidelines, *MedEdPORTAL* editors use the following rubric to score reviews:

- 5 = Exceptional - Outstanding critique that is comprehensive, insightful, and well-written, addresses both content and pedagogy, and serves as an exemplar for other reviews.
- 4 = Very good - Above average review that provides a robust set of specific and actionable comments to the author, including minor comments that elevate the quality of the work.
- 3 = Good - Average review that satisfactorily addresses the major issues in the submission.
- 2 = Below Average - Superficial and/or vague review that does not provide helpful guidance to the author for improvement.
- 1 = Unacceptable - Poor review of such low quality or lateness that would not invite this reviewer again.

### 2. Will I be able to earn credit even if there is more than one reviewer per manuscript?

Yes, any reviewer can earn credit for their work.

### 3. Can physician reviewers with international medical degrees receive credit?

*AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™* may be awarded to any physician (defined by the AMA as MDs, DOs, or international physicians with equivalent degrees). *MedEdPORTAL* does ask what degree(s) reviewers hold and will provide a certificate for the following degrees: BMBS, MBBS, MBChB, MB BCh, BMed, MDCM, Dr.MuD, Dr.Med, Cand.med, Med.

### 4. Can I still receive CE credit if I indicate in the evaluation questions that I did not learn as a result of the review?

Yes. Even though your evaluation is required, the awarding of CE credit is based on the quality of your review and is independent of the evaluation of your own learning.

### 5. Can I still receive CE credit if I recommend rejection or revision of the submission?

Yes. It is the quality of the *review* that warrants CE credit, not the quality of the *submission*.

### 6. If the submission goes back for revision, is additional CE credit available for subsequent reviews?

No. Only the first review is eligible for CE credit.

### 7. What do I do if I have not received a notification for credit at the end of the year?

You should contact *MedEdPORTAL* ([mededportal@aamc.org](mailto:mededportal@aamc.org)) to request feedback on your review from the editor. Requests for feedback may take up to 4-6 weeks.