

Revision Request: Aesculapius Proceedings Submission

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your work to the INHWE Aesculapius proceedings. Following review against the conference's Healthcare Proceedings criteria, your submission has been identified as potentially eligible for publication, pending targeted revisions.

The recommendations below apply broadly to all submissions in this category and are intended to support alignment with proceedings standards. Addressing these points will strengthen the scholarly rigor and reviewability of your work. Please address all items that apply to your work.

1. Clarify the scholarly contribution

Clearly articulate the problem, innovation, or question your work addresses and specify its contribution to healthcare, health professions education, public health, policy, or practice.

2. Strengthen methodological or analytical transparency

Ensure that the design, approach, or analytical process is described in sufficient detail for peer review. For conceptual, descriptive, or practice-based papers, explicitly state the framework, evidence base, or rationale guiding the work.

3. Make evaluation or evidence explicit

Where outcomes, impact, or effectiveness are discussed, clarify how these were assessed (e.g., data sources, surveys, qualitative methods, document analysis, or literature review processes). If evaluation is ongoing or preliminary, state this clearly.

4. Improve structure and alignment with proceedings format

Organize the submission so it can stand alone as a proceedings paper or extended abstract, with clear sections (e.g., background, aim/purpose, approach/methods, key findings/insights, implications).

5. Emphasize implications for healthcare practice, education, or policy

Explicitly describe how the work informs practice, curriculum design, workforce development, equity, quality improvement, or health system decision making.

6. Address ethical and contextual considerations where applicable

If human participants, patient data, or sensitive contexts are involved, clarify ethical oversight, consent, or governance considerations, even if formal approval was not required.

These revisions are intended to enhance clarity and scholarly robustness rather than to change the core focus of your work. Once revised, submissions will be reassessed for final proceedings eligibility.

We appreciate your contribution to the conference and look forward to receiving your updated submission.



Author Revision Checklist for Conference Proceedings

Use this checklist to strengthen your submission before resubmission.

Address all items that apply to your work (education-focused, clinical, public health, or policy).

A. Submission Type & Structure

- Clearly identify the submission as a Short Paper or Extended Abstract
- Ensure the length aligns with the stated submission type: Short Paper – 3-4 pages or 2,000 – 3,000 words; Extended Abstract – 1-2 pages or 800-1,500 words.
- Write the paper to stand alone (do not rely on slides or the oral presentation)
- Organize the manuscript with clear sections (Background, Purpose/Aim, Approach/Methods, Key Findings/Insights, Implications/Conclusions)

B. Scholarly Purpose & Contribution

- State a clear purpose, problem, question, or innovation
- Explain why this work matters to healthcare practice, education, policy, or systems
- Make the contribution explicit (e.g., evidence, framework, model, evaluation, or case learning)
- Ensure claims are appropriate in scope and supported by evidence or rationale

C. Context & Population

- Describe the setting, population, or system context
- Provide relevant institutional, geographic, disciplinary, or policy context
- Education-focused submissions: specify learner group, level, and setting
- Clinical or policy submissions: specify care setting, system level, or stakeholder group
- Findings/Insights, Implications/Conclusions)

D. Methodological or Analytical Transparency

- Describe the approach or design clearly and appropriately
- Empirical studies: state data sources, methods, and analysis
- Reviews: state search strategy, inclusion criteria, and synthesis approach
- Conceptual or practice-based papers: identify guiding frameworks, models, or evidence base
- Acknowledge limitations or scope boundaries where relevant

E. Evidence, Evaluation, or Substantiation

- Present outcomes, findings, or key insights clearly
- Make it explicit how conclusions were reached
- Clearly indicate if evaluation is preliminary or ongoing
- Support descriptive or narrative claims with data, literature, or documented experience



F. Ethical & Professional Considerations

- Address ethical oversight, approval, exemption, or justification where applicable
- Respect confidentiality and data governance requirements
- Handle equity-related or sensitive populations appropriately

G. Implications & Relevance

- Clearly state implications for practice, education, policy, workforce, quality, or equity
- Ensure implications are realistic and aligned with the evidence presented

H. Proceedings Readiness

- Provide sufficient detail for peer review
- Use terminology accessible to an interdisciplinary healthcare audience
- Ensure the paper is suitable for archival publication and citation

