

Literature Selection Technical Review Committee
--- Journal Review Summary ---

Title: Canadian Medical Education Journal

Date of Review: 10/22/15

Scope: ___ Core biomedical subjects X Related to medicine ___ More appropriate in another database

Coverage: ___ Predominantly U.S. ___ International X Regional ___ Local

1. Quality	Poor 0	Fair 1	Moderate 2	Good 3	Excellent 4	Outstanding 5	N/A
Scientific Merit (validity, currency of information & references, originality, contribution to field)							
Review Articles				X			
Clinical Research			X				
Basic Research							X
Other (Case Reports, Editorials, etc.)			X				
Authors/Institutions				X			
Editorial Work (credibility of contents)							
Editorial Board Quality				X			
External Peer Review				X			
Production Quality (layout, printing, readability, usability, graphics; number and location of advertisements)							
Print Quality							X
Online Quality				X			
2. Importance							
	None 0	Little 1	Moderate 2	High 3	Very High 4	Outstanding 5	N/A
Researchers			X				
Clinicians in the Field		X					
Clinicians not in the Field		X					
Educators				X			
Administrators		X					
Allied Health Professionals		X					
Students			X				
Policy Makers							X

3. Ethics Policies/Statements							
	Policy Exists			Policy is Adequate		Policy Consistently Followed	
	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Conflict of Interest		X		X			
Human/Animal Rights			X				
Informed Consent			X				
	None	Little	Moderate	High	Very High	Essential	N/A
Ethics Policies		X					

Literature Selection Technical Review Committee
--- Journal Review Summary ---

Title: Canadian Medical Education Journal

Date of Review: 10/22/15

Journal Strengths: This is an electronic (open-access) journal published by the University of Saskatchewan in 2010. Editors and authors are mostly Canadian and are listed with their affiliations and geographic locations. Articles typically contain: structured abstract, keywords, author correspondence, black/white tables, graphs, and images (some are of poor quality). Reviews are generally systematic reviews.

Area(s) for Improvement: The website navigation could be improved. Full manuscript display is clunky—the PDF is slow to load; it takes 2 clicks to display full screen version—the first click displays manuscript inside a small window with no scroll-bar. The link to the Editorial Board is on the “About” page of the website, under the heading of “People”. The listing of editors is confusing, as there is a 2-member “Editorial Board” and a separate “Editorial Team” comprising Editors and Section Editors—this needs to be consolidated into one list. The journal needs to have explicit policy statements about ethical review of research, and also include that information in the research reports. The author guidelines includes a statement about need to disclose COI; however, there is no mention about IRB review or informed consent policies. That said, some studies (involving data collection from medical students, etc) did mention IRB review while others did not. Most studies did not include information on COI disclosures. Funding statements are rarely found in the articles. Study sample sizes tended to be small surveys (somewhat understandable given focus on medical education). Notably, 2014 had only 1 volume and there’s only one volume for 2015 (as of 10/22/15).

	<u>Lowest</u>						<u>Highest</u>
OVERALL RATING	0	1	2	3	4	5	

[Score = 2.0]

The LSTRC assessment of journals is based on several critical elements that serve as a general guide for recommending a journal title to be indexed in MEDLINE. There is no one element by itself that tends to disqualify a journal from being recommended. The overall appraisal of a journal’s scientific content, quality, importance, editorial policies, and subject coverage in MEDLINE determine the LSTRC scoring and recommendation.