

PEER REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC MANUSCRIPTS ASSESSMENT FORM

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

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					
1.1 Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to identify if abstract is a clear representation of the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/> Superficial review of abstract (e.g., identified spelling/grammar, etc).	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured information in abstract appropriately reflects findings in paper.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured that abstract information is complete; suggestions for clarity provided if needed.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Aims of study/ review and	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant gaps in	<input type="checkbox"/> Some gaps in	<input type="checkbox"/> Understands research	<input type="checkbox"/> Understands research question.	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
relevance	understanding of research question and/or relevance to existing literature or clinical knowledge.	understanding of research question and/or relevance to existing literature.	question. Able to identify whether research question is relevant. Has a general impression of how it will add to existing literature in studied population.	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.	
1.3 Methodology (study designs, population, and outcomes; ethical considerations)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to identify if study design is appropriate for the research question.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to assess whether study design is appropriate for the research question.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 Data analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to identify if data analysis methodology is appropriate for the research question.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to assess whether data analysis methodology is appropriate for the research question.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to assess whether data analysis methodology is the most appropriate for the research question. Identifies some limitations of data analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to assess whether data analysis methodology is the most appropriate strategy for the research question; identifies most limitations of data analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5 Results	<input type="checkbox"/> Results accepted at face value. Critical analysis is absent.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to assess whether results are presented clearly and completely (i.e., information on primary and secondary study endpoints provided).	<input type="checkbox"/> Assess whether results are presented clearly and completely in a format consistent with accepted standards of reporting.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6 Discussion/ conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Superficial review (spelling/typos). Uncritical acceptance of author's conclusions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessed whether Discussion/ Conclusions adequately reflect main findings of paper.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessed whether Discussion/ Conclusions adequately reflect main findings of paper, includes relevance of findings to field of study, implications of study findings for readers.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
				not included in the discussion.	
1.7 Tables/ Figures, Appendices	<input type="checkbox"/> Superficial review (spelling/typos).	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured results are clearly displayed and are accurate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured results are clearly displayed, accurate and complement the information in the text.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured Tables/Figures provide adequate information for readers to comprehend and assess study results. Suggests methods to improve presentation of tables/figures if needed.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8 References	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not review references for completeness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured references are complete.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured references are complete and formatted according to journal specifications.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured that references are complete, formatted according to journal specifications, relevant, up-to-date, and reflect current practices/ research data.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9 Language/ Terminology	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to identify instances of stigmatizing language or terminology inconsistent with the People First Charter and the UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines in the manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript includes occasional instances of stigmatizing language or terminology inconsistent with the People First Charter and the UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines. Abbreviations such as PLWH are frequently used throughout rather than writing out the name or identity of the group in full unless in the context of a chart or graph for brevity.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured that language in the manuscript was non-stigmatizing and consistent with the People First Charter and the UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensured that all language in the manuscript was non-stigmatizing and consistent with the People First Charter and the UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines. People are not referred to as abbreviations such as PLWH, unless in the context of a chart or graph for brevity.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 WRITTEN FEEDBACK					
2.1 Comments to the editor(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to make a recommendation regarding manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided recommendation on acceptance/revision/ rejection with rationale based on superficial review of quality of manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided recommendation on acceptance/revision/ rejection with rationale based on quality of manuscript and importance of findings.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
2.2 Comments to the author(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided suggestions regarding superficial improvements only (e.g., spelling, grammar, formatting).	<input type="checkbox"/> Identified areas of weakness in the manuscript but specific comments on improvement are vague or lacking.	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided summary of major and minor review comments necessary for manuscript acceptance.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 Professionalism, Sense of responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed repeated reminders to complete review within required time frame. Did not request required assistance. Written review was incomplete or poorly done.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completed review within required time frame with some assistance. Written review lacked some clarity.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completed review within required time frame with minimal assistance. Review was clearly written in professional language. Feedback was provided in a constructive manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completed review in required time frame with no assistance. Review was clearly written, using respectful 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ASSESSMENT OF RESIDENT:

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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>

Last updated May 2023.