Journal Club Rules

Journal club will be divided into 2 one hour segments, the “in-depth” review, and the “lightning round.” The in-depth review will consist of review and critique of current literature, with an emphasis on critical appraisal and study quality. The “lightning round” will be a brief synopsis of the GI literature from the previous month, with an emphasis on “take-home points,” and a minimal critique.

The In-depth Review

1) THE JOURNAL CLUB WILL START PROMPTLY AT 8. THOSE WHO ARE LATE WILL NOT GET THEIR FRUIT CUP.
2) The attending host and each of 2 fellows will present up to 2 papers each (6 total) during this segment. It is acceptable to present one paper.
3) These papers will be chosen by the attending host and the participating fellows jointly, and may (should the attending wish it), conform to a theme, such as IBD, motility, esophagus, liver, etc. If a “theme night” is chosen, papers should still be from within the last 6 months.
4) Not less than 2 weeks prior to the assigned journal club, the fellows will confer with the host attending to decide on appropriate articles.
5) Generally, the articles will be presented in 10 minute slots. The first 5 of the 10 minutes will be a brief explication of the article by the presenter, concentrating on a synopsis of the article with a brief discussion of the article’s strengths and weaknesses. Formal criteria for critiquing articles, such as the McMaster criteria may be useful for organizing your thoughts, however, it is unlikely that both a review of the article and a point-by-point critique of the article describing all of the criteria can be accomplished in 5 minutes, and this is not recommended. In general, “don’t sweat the small stuff,” ie, do not concentrate on minutiae. Stick with the main goals, study design, stated outcomes, and results, and you should have enough time to cover the article and discuss its strengths and weaknesses. An egg timer will be used to time the first 5 minute segment. If the presenter exceeds the 5 minute block allotted for the presentation, they may finish the thought that they are elaborating, and then must stop speaking.
6) For the papers in the “in-depth” round, a brief handout, with sections for “background,” “methods,” “results,” “conclusions,” and “critique,” is desirable, and allows the material to be covered in an expedient manner.
7) The second 5 minutes of the 10 minute block are reserved for open discussion of the paper. During this period, individuals who work in the area discussed by the paper will help the group put the paper in the greater context of the field.
8) At the end of the second 5 minute segment, we will continue on to the next presentation.
9) After the 6 presentations are completed, we will move to the “lightning round.”
The Lightning Round

1) The goal of the lightning round is to provide a brief synopsis of interesting papers in a wide variety of journals. Unlike the “in-depth” portion of journal club, the focus here is on informing, rather than critiquing.

2) As noted in the chart below, the presenters will divide the major journals in which GI materials appear.

3) The presenters will take turns doing a 2 minute presentation of papers of interest in the journals that they are assigned. The goal in these 2 minutes is to make an “ACP journal club”-type statement of the work. What was the question? What was the study design? What are the results? What were the conclusions? If the presenter wishes, they can offer one or two major critiques, but that is not the focus of the lightning round.

4) In the last 3 minutes, other attendees may comment on the importance of the paper, and offer any other thoughts or critiques about the papers.

5) No handouts are necessary for “lightning round” papers. If possible, the presenter may want to make 20 or so copies of the abstract of the “lightning round” papers that (s)he wishes to discuss, 2 per sheet of paper.

6) The goal is to cover at least 12 papers (4 per presenter) in the “lightning round.”

7) Other attendees may also wish to bring “lightning round” papers, especially those papers that are in journals outside of those outlined in the chart below. If so, those papers will only be reviewed time-permitting.

8) THE JOURNAL CLUB WILL END PROMPTLY AT 10 PM. PEOPLE WHO WISH TO TALK MORE AFTER THAT NEED TO GET A HOBBY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Presenter 1</th>
<th>Presenter 2</th>
<th>Presenter 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gastroenterology</td>
<td>Gut</td>
<td>AJG</td>
<td>Jan, April, July, Oct: NEJM, Lancet, Transplantation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other general hints for a successful j club presentation:

1) A couple of sentences to set the study in context is generally all that are necessary. It is not necessary to start with, “Hepatitis B is a major cause of liver-related mortality world-wide.”

2) Use of the table or figure that describes the main result from the paper itself is often helpful to get your point across.
3) Calculation of commonly used clinical epidemiology stats such as number needed to treat, absolute difference, attributable risk, and other data when appropriate often helps your audience to understand the impact of the data.
4) Einstein could explain the theory of relativity on a single sheet of paper. You should be able to tell us what we need to know in a 1 page handout.