

Toxikon's Approach to Journal Club:

We will begin with an introduction and our fellows will then review the articles. We encourage each fellow to take 5 minutes leading us through the paper using the guidelines below; most of their time will be spent on impressions and discussion. Faculty at the local program will provide additional comments, followed by an open forum discussion with all other programs. Our hope is to maximize interaction and to share different perspectives through the interactive online format. Programs are encouraged to “raise their hand” during the discussion period to provide their comments/questions and suggestions.

Our journal clubs include various formats. This journal club is based on one theme that is inspired by a recent article that prompts us to go back to original sources. Others are based on a type of publication. For example we do abstract journal clubs, letters to the editor journal clubs, classic article journal clubs. We also do potpourri (a mixed bag of new topics), and “traditional” style journal clubs.

We suggest reviewing up to 3 articles with an emphasis on group discussion rather than presentation.

Below are suggested points to highlight when presenters review an article:

- 1) Title, first author's name, home institution, journal and date of publication
- 2) Type of article/study (case report or series, randomized trial, animal study, letter, review article, etc.)
- 3) Single sentence rationale for the article/study (objective)
- 4) Brief description of the methods
- 5) Key results of the study (refer to table or graph where appropriate)
- 6) Authors' interpretation of the results (i.e., authors' discussion and conclusion)
- 7) Authors' acknowledged limitations of their article/study
- 8) **Your own impression of the article** – this is the MOST IMPORTANT part of Journal Club and the majority of your presentation to the group should be here.

Some questions to consider:

- Is the title accurate?
- Are methods reasonable?
- Does conclusion fulfill the stated in the objective, or do you notice a disconnect?
- Does statistical analysis make sense?
- Was subject selection fair?
- Will results change your clinical practice?
- How could the study be done better?
- Were there conflicts of interest declared or not declared?
- Was conclusion biased by special interests?
- Does the current study warrant a next step?

Feel free to share your favorite line from the paper.