

## PEER REVIEW OUTLINE: AN EXAMPLE (Courtesy of Dr. Nadja Kadom)

### COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR:

- Provide the editor with a high level summary of reasons why this manuscript should be accepted or rejected.
- Indicate which revisions, if any, are “need to have” (versus “nice to have”)

### Acceptance, sample reasons:

- The manuscript is considered timely and relevant to a current problem
- The manuscript is considered well written, logical, and easy to comprehend
- The study is well designed and has appropriate methodology
- Advances knowledge towards providing better patient care

### Rejection, sample reasons:

- The manuscript is incomplete or has insufficiently described statistics
- The manuscript shows over-interpretation of the results
- The manuscript has suboptimal or insufficiently described means of measuring data
- The manuscript’s sample population is too small or is biased
- The manuscript text is difficult to follow
- The manuscript has an insufficient problem statement

---

### REVIEWER RULES

Reviewers should treat the manuscripts they review as they would like their own manuscripts to be treated:

- Respect the authors (avoid demeaning, insulting or sarcastic statements)
- Provide polite and helpful/actionable feedback
- Frame of mind: This [X] could be more informative if the authors considered doing [Y]
- If you find yourself biased, notify the editor to find a different reviewer

---

### COMMENTS TO THE AUTHORS:

**Brief Synopsis:** Major Strengths, Major Weaknesses, Advances in Knowledge, Clinical Application

#### Title:

- The title appropriately reflects the manuscript theme and findings
- The title could be shortened, for example.....
- The title could be catchier, for example.....

#### The Abstract:

- The abstract appropriately summarizes the manuscript without discrepancies or missing critical information.
- The abstract can be understood by the intended audience without reading the manuscript.

**Introduction:**

- The introduction is written in a concise way and succinctly defines a purpose/aim/goals of the study clearly.
- The authors use the literature to build a justification for conducting the study.
- The study is relevant and important to the advancement of patient care

**Methods:**

- The Methods section is thorough in its explanation of how the study was performed and could be followed by others to reproduce the study.

**Results:**

- The results are clearly explained and parallel the presentation order of the Methods.
- The results are reasonable and make sense.
- The understanding of the results is enhanced by judicious use of supported Tables/Figures

**Discussion**

- The discussion is concisely written and analyzes rather than repeats the results.
- The Discussion's first paragraph summarizes the study findings at a high level and states whether the hypothesis was accepted or rejected.
- The authors include limitations of the study in the second to last paragraph.
- The Discussion ends with a conclusion that is supported by the study results
- The Conclusion/Summary describes the study's relevance for advancements of the current state of knowledge/improved patient care.

**Figures and Graphs**

- The figures complement the manuscript appropriately.
- Figures are appropriately annotated.
- Each figure has a legend with appropriate information/explanation.

**Tables**

- The tables accurately reflect the results and add detail to the result text.
- Each table has a title and legend as appropriate.
- The numbers in the table match the numbers in the manuscript

**References**

- The references are recent.
- The reference format follows the format for the journal.
- I do not know of any important references that have been missed.