

## **JAAPA Manuscript Evaluation Form**

**Manuscript title:**

**Peer reviewer's name:**

### **Tips and Resources for Peer Reviewers:**

1. Before completing your review, please refer to Information for Authors and Peer Reviewers on the journal's website for details about article types as well as the principles and best practices for peer reviewing. Use the following link: <http://journals.lww.com/jaapa/Pages/authorguidelines.aspx>
2. The editors recommend the following resource as another valuable tool and refresher for novice and experienced reviewers: Lovejoy, T., Revenson, T., Frances, R. (2011). Reviewing Manuscripts for Peer-Review Journals: A Primer for Novice and Seasoned Reviewers. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 42: 1-13.
3. When you prepare comments to share with the author and/or editor, please use line numbers (when applicable) to relate any specific changes or concerns. If line numbers are not present, please reference page number and paragraph (i.e. Page 1, paragraph 2: the author is unclear about safety issues of the drug described here).
4. Please ensure that your comments are honest, specific, fair, constructive, and professional.

Here are some examples of appropriate comments:

- “This topic is too obscure to be of interest to most PAs. [Then explain why.]”
- “The paper does not mention important clinical trials published in the past 5 years. Studies that should be mentioned, and their importance discussed, include the following....”
- “The paper is interesting, but it is hard to see why it would be useful to PAs. The author should explain more clearly why PAs should care about this topic.”
- “Lines 57-65 are inaccurate. Several recent studies indicate that this statement is not true. The author should look at [provide brief citations for the studies].”
- “Lines 126-150 tell the PA what to look for, but what should we do when we find it? The author needs to provide details on the next steps to take.”)

### **Peer Reviewer Expertise:**

- Which of the following best describes your level of knowledge of the manuscript's topic?
  - Expert
  - Competent
  - Familiar
  - No knowledge
- Comments related to your level of knowledge:

**Manuscript Rating Worksheet** – Rate the quality of the manuscript using this rubric for systematic evaluation of the manuscript. Simply answer yes (Y) or no (N) for each element, and be prepared to add specific comments when you enter your summary recommendations into the peer review portal (Editorial Manager).

Practicality: The topic is appropriate for publication in a scholarly clinical journal for PAs.

Quality of sources: The paper demonstrates command of the literature on the subject. Important, credible sources are included. References are current and include the most significant new studies from peer-reviewed journals. Primary sources are cited whenever possible. Heavy or inappropriate reliance on textbooks and generic websites is avoided.

*A trick for efficient peer reviewing includes initial fact-checking. Randomly pick five statements in the article and check the accuracy against published content or another authoritative source. If multiple inaccuracies are present, note multiple inaccuracies exist and recommend the manuscript be rejected.*

Accuracy: The paper presents information that is up-to-date, accurate, and evidence-based.

*The most recent literature is cited, and the manuscript critically appraises the cited works in a way that supports the reader's application of the material to patient care.*

Equity: The manuscript identifies factors known to influence health outcomes related to this topic, including social determinants such as racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and sexual and gender minority status.

Usefulness: The paper addresses as appropriate the PA competencies of medical knowledge, interpersonal and communication skills, patient care, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, and systems-based practice.

*Consider if the paper is of practical value to PAs. It provides them with clinical pearls that will help them practice better medicine, or it can help them study for the recertification exam, or it updates them on a significant advance in medicine.*

Readability: The paper is well-written and easy to read.

*Specifically, consider the following elements: Information is presented in an organized way. Headings and subheadings are used effectively. Paragraphs are coherent. The style is readable and easy to follow. Meanings are clear.*

Quality of accessories: Art and other accessories (i.e. tables, figures, graphics, photos, illustrations, etc.) provide value to the reader and agree with the text.

Originality: The manuscript is novel and interesting to publish for a PA audience. The reviewer has no concerns about the originality of the work (plagiarism). Ideas and materials of others are appropriately attributed.

## 2. Comment specifically on the manuscript

Analyze the specific strengths and weaknesses in the article. Address any of the areas under number 1 that you scored as 0, 1, 2, or 3 to provide guidance to the author on how to improve. Use the line numbers in the manuscript file to identify the sections you comment on.

(To the peer reviewer: Do **NOT** make revisions to the text to make it more readable, fix spelling or grammar errors, or otherwise “edit” or “copyedit” the article. *JAAPA* editors will do this if and when the article is accepted. Instead, focus on substantive issues of content that the author must address, or questions that must be answered, before the article can be published.

Here are some examples of appropriate comments for this portion of your peer review:

- “This topic is too obscure to be of interest to most PAs. [Then explain why.]”
- “The paper does not mention important clinical trials published in the past 5 years. Studies that should be mentioned, and their importance discussed, include the following...”
- “The paper is interesting, but it is hard to see why it would be useful to anybody. The author should explain more clearly why PAs should care about this topic.”
- “Lines 57-65 are inaccurate. Several recent studies indicate that this statement is not true. The author should look at [provide brief citations for the studies].”
- “Lines 126-150 tell the PA what to look for. But what should we do when we find it? The author needs to provide details on the next steps to take.”)

## 3. Suggest accessories

Please indicate any x-rays, anatomic drawings, illustrations, tables, algorithms, or other accessories that might improve the article. If you know of online resources that might benefit the reader, please indicate these as well so that the links can be included in the online version of the article.

### A note of caution

We will forward this review form to the author (after we delete your name from the top of the form), whether the manuscript is accepted or rejected. Please check over what you have written to make sure you have not included anything that could inadvertently identify you to the author. Also make sure that the tone and content of your review are appropriate. Your comments should be honest, specific, fair, constructive, and professional.

### Your final recommendation (select one)

- Accept manuscript for publication** (the author does not need to make any revisions)
- Ask author to revise manuscript and re-submit** (if revisions are adequate, the manuscript should be published)
- Reject manuscript** (the article is not suitable for *JAAPA*, either because the topic is not suitable or the quality of the manuscript is too poor)

**Please add any final comments.**