**UNIVERSITY HEALTH NETWORK/ McGILL UNIVERSITY HEALTH CENTRE HIV ADVANCED (YEAR 2) RESIDENCY PROGRAM**

**PEER REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC MANUSCRIPTS ASSESSMENT FORM**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Resident Name:** | **Preceptor Name:** | **Date:** |
| **Type of manuscript reviewed:**** Case report / case series**** Pharmacokinetic study**** Observational study/pilot study**** Randomized, controlled interventional study**** Therapeutic review/meta-analysis**** Guidelines/clinical recommendations**** Other** | **Target Publication:** ** Pharmacy journal**** Pharmacology journal**** Medical journal - HIV**** Medical journal - general**** Thesis/research project report**** Other** | ** 1st peer review activity**** 2nd peer review activity**** \_\_\_\_\_\_ peer review activity****\*PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE BLINDED REVIEW ASSESSMENT TO THIS EVALUATION (remove author names, institution, journal, etc).** |

**ACTIVITY OUTCOMES:**

The resident will develop skills and gain experience in completing reviews of manuscript(s) submitted to a pharmacy or medical journal for publication.

The resident will complete at least one peer review of a manuscript during the residency year at an overall Proficient level.

This may include reviewing Year 1 residency project manuscripts or MScPhm thesis reports being prepared for publication.

|  | **Advanced Beginner (1)** | **Competent (2)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Expert (4)** | **Not Applicable** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MANUSCRIPT CONTENT** |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. **Abstract**
 | ****Unable to identify if abstract is a clear representation of the paper. | ****Superficial review of abstract (e.g., identified spelling/grammar, etc). | ****Ensured information in abstract appropriately reflects findings in paper. | ****Ensured that abstract information is complete; suggestions for clarity provided if needed. | **** |
| * 1. **Aims of study/ review and relevance**
 | ****Significant gaps in understanding of research question and/or relevance to existing literature or clinical knowledge. | Some gaps in understanding of research question and/or relevance to existing literature. | Understands research question. Able to identify whether research question is relevant. Has a general impression of how it will add to existing literature in studied population. | Understands research question. Able to identify whether research question is relevant, original and how it will add to existing literature in studied population and applicability to other populations. | **** |
| * 1. **Methodology (study designs, population, and outcomes; ethical considerations)**
 | Unable to identify if study design is appropriate for the research question. | Able to assess whether study design is appropriate for the research question.  | Able to assess whether study design and other aspects of the methodology is the most appropriate strategy for the research question. Identifies some limitations of methodology used. | Able to assess whether study design and other aspects of methodology are the most appropriate strategy for the research question; identifies most limitations of methodology used. | **** |
| * 1. **Data analysis**
 | Unable to identify if data analysis methodology is appropriate for the research question. | Able to assess whether data analysis methodology is appropriate for the research question. | Able to assess whether data analysis methodology is the most appropriate for the research question. Identifies some limitations of data analysis. | Able to assess whether data analysis methodology is the most appropriate strategy for the research question; identifies most limitations of data analysis. | **** |
| * 1. **Results**
 | Results accepted at face value. Critical analysis is absent. | Able to assess whether results are presented clearly and completely (i.e., information on primary and secondary study endpoints provided). | Assess whether results are presented clearly and completely in a format consistent with accepted standards of reporting. | Assess whether results are presented clearly and completely in a format consistent with accepted standards of reporting. Identifies missing data or information which would add to the quality of the paper or interpretation of the findings. | **** |
| * 1. **Discussion/ conclusion**
 | Superficial review (spelling/typos). Uncritical acceptance of author’s conclusions. | Assessed whether Discussion/ Conclusions adequately reflect main findings of paper. | Assessed whether Discussion/ Conclusions adequately reflect main findings of paper, includes relevance of findings to field of study, implications of study findings for readers. | Assessed whether Discussion includes relevance of findings to field of study, how study results compared to other similar studies (if applicable), implications of study findings for readers, and suggestions for future research. Highlights limitations of the study that are not included in the discussion. | **** |
| * 1. **Tables/ Figures, Appendices**
 | Superficial review (spelling/typos). | Ensured results are clearly displayed and are accurate. | Ensured results are clearly displayed, accurate and complement the information in the text. | Ensured Tables/Figures provide adequate information for readers to comprehend and assess study results. Suggests methods to improve presentation of tables/figures if needed. | **** |
| * 1. **References**
 | ****Did not review references for completeness. | ****Ensured references are complete. | ****Ensured references are complete and formatted according to journal specifications. | ****Ensured that references are complete, formatted according to journal specifications, relevant, up-to-date, and reflect current practices/ research data. | **** |
| 1. **WRITTEN FEEDBACK**
 |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. **Comments to the editor(s)**
 | ****Unable to make a recommendation regarding manuscript. | ****Provided recommendation on acceptance/revision/ rejection with rationale based on superficial review of quality of manuscript. | ****Provided recommendation on acceptance/revision/ rejection with rationale based on quality of manuscript and importance of findings.  | ****Provided recommendation on acceptance/revision/ rejection with rationale based on quality of manuscript and importance of findings. Provided opinion on priority of manuscript publication and whether an accompanying editorial is required. | **** |
| * 1. **Comments to the author(s)**
 | ****Provided suggestions regarding superficial improvements only (e.g., spelling, grammar, formatting). | ****Identified areas of weakness in the manuscript but specific comments on improvement are vague or lacking. | ****Provided summary of major and minor review comments necessary for manuscript acceptance. | ****Provided summary of major and minor review comments necessary for manuscript acceptance. Comments are organized in a manner which allows authors to easily identify areas of concern and respond. | **** |
| * 1. **Professionalism, Sense of responsibility**
 | ****Needed repeated reminders to complete review within required time frame. Did not request required assistance. Written review was incomplete or poorly done. | Completed review within required time frame with some assistance. Written review lacked some clarity. | Completed review within required time frame with minimal assistance. Review was clearly written in professional language. Feedback was provided in a constructive manner. | Completed review in required time frame with no assistance. Review was clearly written, using respectiveful and constructive language and appropriate terminology. Feedback was provided in a constructive manner. |  |

**RESIDENT’S PERSONAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC MANUSCRIPTS**

**Please assess whether the resident’s personal learning objectives were met**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE** | **Unmet** | **Partially Met** | **Met** | **Not Applicable** |
| List personal learning objectives |
|  | **** | **** | ****  | **** |
|  | **** | **** | ****  | **** |
|  | **** | **** | ****  | **** |

**ASSESSMENT OF RESIDENT:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Advanced Beginner (1) | Competent (2) | Proficient (3) | Expert (4) |
| OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE | ****Required significant guidance to conduct review at the proficient level. Some gaps identified that require further focused development. | ****Competently conducted review with some guidance.  | ****Proficient to conduct review with minimal guidance. | ****Conducted review at an expert level, with little to no guidance. |
| **The resident must have an overall assessment of 3 or 4. If this is not achieved, the resident will be asked to complete a second peer review of a scientific manuscript.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resident Comments: | Preceptor Comments: |
| Resident Signature | Preceptor Signature |
| Date | Date |

**Adapted from Cardon J. Example of Critiques of Scientific Articles. Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, USA** [**https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/evaluation-of-critiques-of-scientific-articles.shtml**](https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/evaluation-of-critiques-of-scientific-articles.shtml)

*Last updated July 2020.*