

CFMS Committee on Health Policy Review



Paper Title: National Seniors Strategy

Paper Type: Position Paper

Meeting: AGM 2019 (St. John's)

Reviewer 1

General Comments: The care and interest of the writers is clear and evident in this paper – congratulations on your personalized attention with the administration of the survey, and the excellent research to support your suggestions. All the arguments are sensible and present a unified and sensible CFMS stance.

Strengths:

1. **Topic:** Well-justified case for creating a CFMS position on this topic as it relates to both medical education and care of future patients.
2. **Representation:** Addresses a national perspective applicable to all medical students.

Areas of Improvement:

1. **Scope:** The body of this paper clearly and eloquently focusses on medical education, with a short suggestion about funding strategies for palliative care (which is not mentioned in the introduction, conclusion, or recommendations). Consider that this policy section may detract from the strong body of work before it, as there may be insufficient space to argue for both within the scope of this paper.

Minor:

2. **Grammar:** Several sentences in the introduction are grammatically incorrect, and are unclear as a result.
3. **Formatting:**
 - a. Recommend listing your topics of recommendation in the same order as they are presented in the body of your paper (e.g., Palliative, then Polypharmacy, then Caregivers -- right now they are discordant).
 - b. Phrase recommendations with consistent sentence structure (e.g., 'to verb', vs. 'verb').
4. **Consideration of Status Quo:** Given that it cannot be known which schools are already doing any of these recommendations and to what extent, consider including in your conclusion a statement that acknowledges these recommendations may be in play, commend them if they are, and encourage others to follow suit.

Reviewer 2

Reviewer 2

General Comments:

This is a well written paper and is nearing readiness for presentation at the AGM.

Strengths:

The research in this paper is a strong underpinning to your arguments, and results in a logical progression of thought. The paper has been able to remain fairly concise given the significant detail still contained.

Areas of Improvement:

Please consider disclosing your ethical process in creating the survey. For example, noting there was no ethics process and the extent of information provided to students regarding use of their information. Position paper or not, this is reasonable inclusion in disclosure of any data collected from persons.

Unaddressed: I note that your references list is not complete and is commonly missing details such as page numbers. Please make sure your references list accurately lists references. For example, your paper cites the below paper. However, I am not sure "Narnia" is a date/volume/page number.

Example: Pinqart, M., & Sörensen, S. (2007). Correlates of physical health of informal caregivers: A meta-analysis. *Journals of Gerontology - Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*. Narnia.

Unaddressed: I believe this paper is missing a "Principles" section. Please follow the format for position papers provided by the Committee on Health Policy online.

