

You Should Try This!

This section includes short descriptions of new initiatives (often student or resident led) that are great ideas but not yet fully developed, researched, or evaluated. This section is for sharing these good ideas that could (and maybe should) be tried in another setting or center. Submissions to this section must include some evaluation and/or measures of outcomes, and provide suggestions for next steps. All You Should Try This submissions are limited to 500 words, one Table or Figure, and six references. Instead of an abstract, authors are asked to submit an Implication Statement of no more than 100 words describing how people might use the innovation in their own setting.

In your review please attend primarily to the scientific merits of the manuscript and the clarity of the writing. If English is not the author's first language and the English needs editing, please mention this to the editor. However, such an article should not be rejected if it is otherwise worthy of consideration. You do not need to comment on spelling, language, or grammatical errors unless they affect the clarity of the content.

Thank you!

1. Title - Is the title as brief as possible while still reflecting the content of the paper? It should not contain abbreviations or acronyms (except in brackets after the full name).

2. Implication Statement -Does the Implication Statement adequately describe the contribution of the paper? Does it describe how and why people might use the innovation in their own setting and what they might get out of it?

- 3. Introduction - Does the introduction clearly state the purpose of the study and provide appropriate (but brief) background from the existing literature? Do the authors describe the scope of the problem, the need for the innovation, and how this innovation is new or unique?

- 4. Innovation- Do the authors describe why a particular innovation was developed? Did a framework, theory, or principal guide development of the innovation? Is the innovative nature of the program clearly defined? What else would you need to know to try the innovation at your institution?

- 5. Evaluation - Are the metrics used to evaluate the innovation clearly defined? Are the results presented clearly and supported by a single table or figure where appropriate? Are the statistical data complete, presented clearly, and in the correct notation? Do the authors report feasibility outcomes (costs, acceptability)?

- 6. Next Steps - Does this section clarify the meaning and implications of the results? Have the authors considered the preconditions required for others to replicate the innovation in their own setting? Are the limitations of the study acknowledged? Are suggestions made for next steps?

- 7. References - Are the references appropriate for the content of the manuscript? Is the number of references adequate (maximum 6)? Are they in the proper citation format for medical journals? If not, you do not need to correct them but please mention it in your comments.

- 8. Table or Figure - Is the table structured logically and does it clearly present the results of the study? Is the figure easy to read and follow? Is there too much or too little information in the table or figure (max. 1)?

9. Comments for the author(s)

Please include the major and minor revisions you recommend to the author(s) - these can be uploaded as a separate file if you wish.*

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms