**Invited vs. Submitted Papers**

***Review Process***

One of the major functions of the Scientific Review & Editorial Committee (SREC) is to review and select papers for inclusion in all of the educational meetings offered by the AAEP. There are two categories of papers: invited papers and submitted papers. The review and submission process for these two types of papers is slightly different.

**Invited Papers**

Invited papers (which include In-depth papers, Invited How-To papers, and nearly all papers for the Focus, 360°, and Resort meetings) are situations in which the speaker has been chosen by the meeting or session chair to present on a specific topic. These speakers submit papers that conform to the paper guidelines for the specific type of paper. The papers are then reviewed by the section facilitator and two members of the SREC. The reviewers submit comments and revisions for the author as needed. The reviewers should consider factors such as: clarity of writing, completeness, factual errors, accessibility for the intended audience, adherence to paper guidelines, etc. Some papers may need quite a bit of revision, but the speakers have been chosen for their expertise in the topic, so this will be uncommon. Essentially, the decision for the reviewer is to determine if the paper is acceptable as written or if it needs revisions. If it needs revisions, reviewer comments will be sent to the author who will then revise the paper and resubmit it for re-review and determine if it is now acceptable. Invited papers for the Annual Convention are due February 3. Edits to the paper should be made using the “track changes” feature. This makes it easier to communicate with the writer (reviewers’ identities are anonymous – all track changes sent to the authors will look like they originated from the AAEP office) and the other reviewers. SREC members will likely receive additional invited papers to review throughout the year for some of the other AAEP CE offerings.

**Submitted Papers**

Three reviewers will be assigned to score each submitted paper using the numerical grading criteria and will upload their scores and comments to the eShow website. Scores will be due on a set date in April. The scores and comments for the section will be available to reviewers to allow them to review scores and comments of their fellow reviewers prior to the section teleconference.

Section teleconferences will be held on a set date in April, to be scheduled by the section facilitator with assistance from the SREC chair and SREC vice chair.

The goal of the section teleconference is to come out of the call having divided papers into one of three categories: definitely accepted, definitely not accepted, and maybe. The categorization of papers into these categories will be accomplished during the section conference call so that all reviewers have the chance to review scores and comments of fellow reviewers, discuss the submissions, and come to a consensus of what category the paper belongs in. This is essentially a mini- SREC meeting. So each section facilitator should come to the Educational Programs Committee (EPC) meeting in April with papers grouped into one of three baskets: definitely accepted, definitely not accepted, and maybe papers. The maybe paper category should be categorized into leaning towards accept and leaning towards reject.

The EPC decided (April 2012) to rank how to, review, and scientific abstract papers in separate categories and have a suggested minimum number of papers in each category for the program as a whole. A decision was made to have 20-25% how to, 5-8% reviews, and 70-75% scientific abstracts as a general goal. This does not include the invited how-to papers.

*250-Word Abstracts*

All 250-word abstracts must be accompanied by a publishable, 1500-word long paper. The long paper should be considered for content only and not grammar. Materials & Methods and Results should be critically reviewed, but the full paper should not be reviewed as a stand-alone, since AAEP will publish only the abstract.

The Scientific Review & Editorial Committee (SREC) is charged with creating and reviewing educational content to produce high-quality CE for the AAEP. The committee is composed of AAEP member volunteers from both small and large private practices as well as academia and industry.   Members include both general practitioners and specialists.

The convention program includes invited papers for the “In-depth” and “How to” sessions as well as sessions comprised of papers that independent authors submitted for consideration. Topic choices for the invited “In Depth” and “How To” sessions are based on member feedback from AAEP CE Needs Analysis surveys. Topic session leaders are selected by the Program Chair, and then these session leaders invite a slate of speakers to prepare the papers that become an “In Depth” overview or a series of related “How To” talks. Although invited, these papers undergo a rigorous peer review process by the SREC.

Papers submitted by independent authors are each assigned 3 reviewers from the SREC. The reviewers do not know the names of the paper authors. Content is scored using the criteria of Study Design, Study Quality, Innovation and Impact, Practicality, and Manuscript Quality.

Non-scientific sessions addressing business, ethical and industry concerns are also planned as the scientific program materializes. Speakers who are invited to participate in these sessions prepare papers that are also reviewed by members of the SREC for inclusion in the Proceedings.

The peer review process for the AAEP Proceedings is rigorous. It requires an enormous effort by every one of the 50 members of the SREC to create the best possible program for the AAEP membership.  Many volunteer hours are spent putting together the convention program.