

Publishing Community-Based Participatory Research

Annotated Bibliography by Eric Bass

1. Black N, van Rooyen S, Godlee F, Smith R, Evans S. What makes a good reviewer and a good review for a general medical journal? *JAMA*. 1998; 280: 231-3.
This article describes an instrument for assessing the quality of a review. It reports that review quality increased with time spent on a review, up to 3 hours.
2. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig LM, Lijmer JG, Moher D, Rennie D, de Vet HC; Standards for Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy. Towards complete and accurate reporting of studies of diagnostic accuracy: The STARD Initiative. *Ann Intern Med*. 2003; 138: 40-4.
This article presents specific guidance on how to report studies of the accuracy of a diagnostic test. Many journals have adopted these standards.
3. Browner, WS. Publishing and presenting clinical research. Baltimore: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 1999.
This book is a useful reference for those interested in learning more about how to publish and present clinical studies.
4. Callahan ML, Baxt WG, Waeckerle JF, Wears RL. Reliability of editors' subjective quality ratings of peer reviews of manuscripts. *JAMA*. 1998; 280: 229-31.
This study found that editor ratings of individual reviewers were moderately reliable and correlated with reviewer ability to report manuscript flaws.
5. Connors K, Seifer SD.(Eds). Partnership Perspectives. Issue II, Vol.I. San Francisco, CA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2000. http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/summer1-f.pdf.
This is an excellent source for a perspective on community health partnerships.
6. Docherty M. The case for structuring the discussion of scientific papers. *Brit Med J*. 1999; 318: 1224-5.
This article presents a logical approach to organizing the discussion section of a paper.
7. Education Group for Guidelines on Evaluation. Guidelines for evaluating papers on educational interventions. *BMJ*. 1999; 318: 1265-7.
The article includes a checklist of items to consider when writing a paper about an educational intervention.
8. Goodman S, Berlin J, Fletcher S, Fletcher R. Manuscript quality before and after peer review and editing at *Annals of Internal Medicine*. *Ann Intern Med*. 1994; 121:11-21.
This study demonstrated that most manuscripts had much room for improvement and that peer review and editing could improve reports in ways that are important to readers.
9. Green LW, Glasgow RE. Evaluating the relevance, generalization, and applicability of research: Issues in external validation and translation methodology. *Eval Health Prof*. 2006; 29: 126-53.
The authors offer great insight about evaluating the external validity of a study.
10. Green ML. Identifying, appraising, and implementing medical education curricula: A guide for medical educators. *Ann Intern Med*. 2001; 135: 889-96.
The article gives guidance on how to identify and appraise a report about an educational program.
11. Guidelines and Categories for Classifying Participatory Research Projects in Health. Ontario. Available from: <http://www.lgreen.net/guidelines.html>.
The guidelines highlight fundamental principles of community partnerships.
12. Hartman EE. Medical writing: What editors look for and how to improve your manuscripts. Workshop presentation at the National SGIM Meeting; 1999 Apr 30; San Francisco, CA.
Anyone interested in writing more clearly and succinctly should take this workshop.
13. Huth EJ. How to Write and Publish Papers in the Medical Sciences, 2nd ed. Baltimore, MD: Williams and Wilkins, 1990.
This may be the gold standard reference on writing for publication in medical journals.
14. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals. *Ann Intern Med*. 1997; 126:36-47. Also available at www.icjme.org.

This article summarizes what most editors expect authors to do when preparing a manuscript for submission to a medical journal.

15. Israel BA, Eng E, Schulz AJ, Parker EA, Satcher D. *Methods in Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
This is a comprehensive textbook written by leaders in the field of CBPR.
16. Israel BA, Schulz AJ, Becker AB. Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 1998; 19: 173-202.
This article focuses on the assessment of partnerships in CBPR.
17. Minkler M. Community-based research partnerships: Challenges and opportunities. *J Urban Health Bulletin NY Acad Med*. 2005; 82 (2 Supp 2): ii3-12.
This article discusses the challenges encountered in CBPR.
18. Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, Olkin I, Rennie D, Stroup DF. Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the QUOROM statement. *Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses*. *Lancet*. 1999; 354: 1896-900.
The QUORUM statement gives clear recommendations on how to report meta-analyses.
19. Moher D, Schulz KF, Altman DG. The CONSORT statement: revised recommendations for improving the quality of reports of parallel group randomized trials. The CONSORT Group. *Ann Intern Med*. 2001; 134: 657-62.
The CONSORT Statement gives specific recommendations on how to report the results of randomized controlled trials. Many journals have adopted these recommendations.
20. O'Fallon LR, Dearry Y. Community-based participatory research as a tool to advance environmental health sciences. *Environ Health Perspectives*. 2002; 110: 155-9.
This article may be useful for those interested in the application of CBPR methods to environmental health issues.
21. O'Toole T, Felix-Aaron K, Chin MH, Horowitz C, Tyson F. Community-based participatory research: Opportunities, challenges and the need for a common language. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2003; 18: 592-4.
This is the editorial from the special issue on CBPR that inspired this workshop.
22. Pitkin RM, Branagan MA, Burmeister LF. Accuracy of data in abstracts of published research articles. *JAMA*. 1999; 281: 1110-11.
Data in abstracts frequently were inconsistent with or absent from the article's main text.
23. Reed D, Price EG, Windish DM, Wright SM, Gozu A, Hsu EB, Beach MC, Kern D, Bass EB. Challenges in systematic reviews of educational intervention studies. *Ann Intern Med*. 2005; 142 (12 Pt 2): 1080-9.
This article summarizes challenges likely to be encountered when conducting a systematic review of interventions in medical education, identifies limitations in the methods that have been used to assess educational interventions, and provides recommendations for reporting and reviewing studies of educational interventions.
24. Resnich CB, Anderson WA. A suggested outline for writing curriculum development journal articles: the IDCRD format. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*. 2000;13:4-8.
This outline may help educators organize articles about curriculum development efforts.
25. Skelton JR, Edwards SJL. The function of the discussion section in academic medical writing. *BMJ*. 2000; 320: 1269-70.
The authors disagree with the above article by Docherty and argue that it is desirable to have some speculative language in the discussion section.
26. Viswanathan M, Ammerman A, Eng E, et al. *Community-Based Participatory Research: Assessing the Evidence*. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 99. AHRQ Publication 04-E022-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, July 2004.
This is a systematic review of the literature on CBPR.
27. Wainer H. How to display data badly. *The American Statistician*. 1984; 38: 137-47.
This is a collection of classic examples of how not to display data.
28. Welch HG, Froehlich GW. Strategies in writing for a physician audience. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1996; 11: 50-55.
This offers practical advice on how to make the process of writing easier.