

Annals of Internal Medicine: How One journal Uses Reporting Checklists

Christine Laine, MD, MPH

- Clinical Trials Registration
- Observational studies
- Diagnostic test studies
- Cost-effectiveness studies
- Reviews
- Systematic Reviews & Meta-analyses
- Narrative Reviews
- Letters
- Clinical observations
- Rapid responses
- Other
- Abroad
- Academia and Clinic
- Ad Libitum
- Editorials
- Guidelines & Position Papers
- History of Medicine
- Improving Patient Care
- In the Balance
- Medicine and Public Issues
- On Being a Doctor/Patient



including case series and important case reports of new, serious adverse drug effects. We consider both narrative and systematic reviews. Narrative reviews are especially suitable for describing cutting-edge and evolving developments, and discussing those developments in light of underlying theory. Systematic reviews are especially suitable for critiquing and summarizing a body of evidence relevant to focused questions about diagnostic, prognostic, or therapeutic clinical practices. For narrative reviews, we ask that authors include a box listing 3 to 7 take-home points that link back to the original questions that the review set out to answer. We also publish guidelines, position papers, letters, and essays about controversial medical issues, medical history, medicine and public policy, and patients' or physicians' experiences of illness.

Requirements for all categories of articles largely conform to the "Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals," developed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors ([ICMJE](#)). Authors should write for a sophisticated general medical readership; follow principles of clear scientific writing ([Gopen, Huth, CBESMC](#)) and statistical reporting ([Bailar, Lang](#)); and prepare manuscripts according to recommended reporting guidelines and checklists ([EQUATOR](#)) whenever possible.

We consider only online submissions ([click here](#) to submit online). When submitting manuscripts, authors should also submit a copy of the original research protocol and other supplemental data as attachments if you think they would help the editors or reviewers to better understand the work. Include reprints of published papers and manuscripts of papers in press that contain data that appear in the submitted manuscript to help the editors form a judgment about the degree of duplicate publication (see [Acknowledge Previous or Duplicate](#)

“Please refer to the following reporting recommendations for observational studies when revising the manuscript: Vandembroucke J, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): Explanation and elaboration. Ann Intern Med. 2007;147 W163-W194. the STROBE recommendations are available at www.annals.org and at www.strobe-statement.org.”

“Since you are reporting the results of a randomized trial, please follow the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT). You will find a summary of these guidelines in “Information for Authors” on our web site (<http://www.annals.org>).”

“Please review the QUORUM statement for reporting of meta-analyses of randomized trials that was published in Lancet 1999;354:1896-1900. Ensure that the manuscript complies with the reporting guidelines and that it includes a figure that summarizes the search and selection process.”

“Please review the MOOSE statement for reporting of meta-analyses of observational studies that was published in JAMA 2000;283:2008-12. Please follow these recommendations when preparing your revision.”

What else might journals do?

- Provide checklists for reviewers
- Formal checklists for editors
- Make review of reporting standards an explicit part of statistical review
- Involve production staff
- Develop templates for manuscript preparation and require authors to use them