

PostScript

CORRECTIONS

doi: 10.1136/emj.2004.015586corr1

In the short report titled, Not all cases of neck pain with/without torticollis are benign: unusual presentations in a paediatric accident and emergency department (*Emerg Med J* 2005; 22:645–8) two errors have occurred. The corresponding address for A Natarajan is incorrect and should be Consultant Paediatrician, anatarajan@hotmail.com. The second error is in the legend for figure 1. It should read 'T1-weighted MRI scan of the cervical spine showing a large intramedullary tumour in the cervical and upper thoracic region C1-T2.' The journal apologises for these errors.

doi: 10.1136/emj.2003.11403corr1

An author's error occurred in the paper titled Hazardous drinkers in the accident and emergency department—Who accepts advice? (*Emerg Med J* 2004;21:491–2). Incorrect proportions for 'Believed initial AED attendance related to drinking' appear in table 1 (A). The figures were calculated using a denominator based on the number of responses to that item, rather than the number of patients who were offered advice. The correct proportions are 49.9 for 'Accepted advice' and 45.9 for 'Did not accept advice' (not 70.1 and 69.8 as stated in the text). The difference in proportion (95% CI) should read 4.0 (-2.1 to 10.1).

doi: 10.1136/emj.2003.10247corr1

In the paper titled, Comparison of the effectiveness of intravenous diltiazem and metoprolol in the management of rapid ventricular rate in atrial fibrillation (*Emerg Med J* 2005;22:411–4) an error has occurred in table 4. At 20 minutes, places of systolic and diastolic pressures were exchanged. The author apologises for this error.

doi: 10.1136/emj.2005.002005

In part 15 of the ABC of community emergency care (*Emerg Med J* 2005;22: 564–71) the legend for figure 2 is incorrect. It should read 'Sixth nerve palsy right eye: failure of abduction. Courtesy of Dr P Marazzi/SPL model released'.

Clinical Evidence—Call for contributors

Clinical Evidence is a regularly updated evidence-based journal available worldwide both as a paper version and on the internet. *Clinical Evidence* needs to recruit a number of new contributors. Contributors are healthcare professionals or epidemiologists with experience in evidence-based medicine and the ability to write in a concise and structured way.

Areas for which we are currently seeking authors:

- Child health: nocturnal enuresis
- Eye disorders: bacterial conjunctivitis
- Male health: prostate cancer (metastatic)
- Women's health: pre-menstrual syndrome; pyelonephritis in non-pregnant women

However, we are always looking for others, so do not let this list discourage you.

Being a contributor involves:

- Selecting from a validated, screened search (performed by in-house Information Specialists) epidemiologically sound studies for inclusion.
- Documenting your decisions about which studies to include on an inclusion and exclusion form, which we keep on file.
- Writing the text to a highly structured template (about 1500–3000 words), using evidence from the final studies chosen, within 8–10 weeks of receiving the literature search.
- Working with *Clinical Evidence* editors to ensure that the final text meets epidemiological and style standards.
- Updating the text every six months using any new, sound evidence that becomes available. The *Clinical Evidence* in-house team will conduct the searches for contributors; your task is simply to filter out high quality studies and incorporate them in the existing text.
- To expand the topic to include a new question about once every 12–18 months.

If you would like to become a contributor for *Clinical Evidence* or require more information about what this involves please send your contact details and a copy of your CV, clearly stating the clinical area you are interested in, to Klara Brunnhuber (kbrunnhuber@bmjgroup.com).

Call for peer reviewers

Clinical Evidence also needs to recruit a number of new peer reviewers specifically with an interest in the clinical areas stated above, and also others related to general practice. Peer reviewers are healthcare professionals or epidemiologists with experience in evidence-based medicine. As a peer reviewer you would be asked for your views on the clinical relevance, validity, and accessibility of specific topics within the journal, and their usefulness to the intended audience (international generalists and healthcare professionals, possibly with limited statistical knowledge). Topics are usually 1500–3000 words in length and we would ask you to review between 2–5 topics per year. The peer review process takes place throughout the year, and our turnaround time for each review is ideally 10–14 days.

If you are interested in becoming a peer reviewer for *Clinical Evidence*, please complete the peer review questionnaire at www.clinicalevidence.com or contact Klara Brunnhuber (kbrunnhuber@bmjgroup.com).