

## JANAC Manuscript Review Template

### Feature Article: **Qualitative Research**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Does the abstract provide a clear overview of the paper in 150 words or less?
		Do the authors provide a list of appropriate key words?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Are 3-6 key considerations, with a focus on clinical considerations, included after the references?
		Are the key considerations more than a rehash or synopsis of the paper?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this research?
		Is the purpose of the research clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Was IRB approval documented?
		Is the design appropriate to the research question?
		Is the qualitative design described in sufficient detail in the paper to permit replication?
		Are the recruitment methods sufficiently described?
		Are the data collection methods sufficiently described?
		Are the sample and sampling method appropriate to answer the research question?
		Are the dates of data collection included in the paper?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
		Do the authors discuss data saturation?
		Was the approach to data analysis sufficiently described?
		Do the authors provide details about rigor of qualitative data analysis (credibility, neutrality or confirmability, consistency or dependability, applicability or transferability, trustworthiness)?
		Are the results of the data analysis clearly presented in the narrative and/or data tables?
<b>Discussion</b>		
		Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by their data?
		Are the findings considered in the context of the existing literature?

**Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:**

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

**Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

**Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper

**JANAC Manuscript Review Template**  
**Feature Article: Quantitative Research**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Does the abstract provide a clear overview of the paper in 150 words or less?
		Do the authors provide a list of appropriate key words?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Are 3-6 key considerations, with a focus on clinical considerations, included after the references?
		Are the key considerations more than a rehash or synopsis of the paper?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this research?
		Is the purpose of the research clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Was IRB approval documented?
		Is the design appropriate to the research question?
		Is the design described in sufficient detail in the paper to permit replication (secondary data analysis with sufficient description of parent study; descriptive, cross-sectional study; and so forth)?
		Are the recruitment methods sufficiently described?
		Are the data collection methods sufficiently described?
		Are the sample and sampling method appropriate to answer the research question?
		Are the dates of data collection included in the paper?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
		Is statistical power adequately addressed?
		Are the psychometric properties (reliability/validity) of the instruments, if applicable, described in sufficient detail?
		Do the authors provide sufficient details about the data analysis plan (covariates, selection of statistical tests, and so forth)?
		Are statistical tests used appropriately to answer the research question?
		Are the results of the data analysis clearly presented in the narrative and/or data tables?
<b>Discussion</b>		
		Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by their data?
		Are the findings considered in the context of the existing literature?

**Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:**

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

**Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

**Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper

**JANAC Manuscript Review Template**

**Feature Article: Mixed-Methods Research**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Does the abstract provide a clear overview of the paper in 150 words or less?
		Do the authors provide a list of appropriate key words?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Are 3-6 key considerations, with a focus on clinical considerations, included after the references?
		Are the key considerations more than a rehash or synopsis of the paper?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this research?
		Is the purpose of the research clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Was IRB approval documented?
		Is the design appropriate to the research question?
		Is the qualitative design described in sufficient detail in the paper to permit replication?
		Are the recruitment methods sufficiently described?
		Are the data collection methods sufficiently described?
		Are the sample and sampling method appropriate to answer the research question?
		Are the dates of data collection included in the paper?
		Do the measures have sufficient biometric/psychometric rigor?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
		Do the authors discuss data saturation?
		Was the approach to qualitative data analysis sufficiently described?
		Do the authors provide details about rigor of qualitative data analysis (credibility, neutrality or confirmability, consistency or dependability, applicability or transferability, trustworthiness)?
		Is statistical power adequately addressed?
		Are the psychometric properties (reliability/validity) of the instruments, if applicable, described in sufficient detail?
		Do the authors provide sufficient details about the data analysis plan (covariates, selection of statistical tests, and so forth)?
		Are statistical tests used appropriately to answer the research question?
		Are the quantitative and qualitative results of the data analysis integrated and clearly presented in the narrative and/or data tables?
<b>Discussion</b>		
		Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by their data?
		Are the findings considered in the context of the existing literature?

**Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:**

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

**Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

**Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper

**JANAC Manuscript Review Templates**  
**Feature Article: Clinical Trial Research**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Does the abstract provide a clear overview of the paper in 150 words or less?
		Do the authors provide a list of appropriate key words?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Are 3-6 key considerations, with a focus on clinical considerations, included after the references?
		Are the key considerations more than a rehash or synopsis of the paper?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this research?
		Is the purpose of the research clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Was IRB approval documented?
		Is the design appropriate to the research question?
		Is the design described in sufficient detail in the paper to permit replication (randomized clinical trial)?
		Are the recruitment methods sufficiently described?
		Are the data collection methods sufficiently described?
		Are the sample and sampling method appropriate to answer the research question?
		Is statistical power adequately addressed?
		Are the dates of data collection included in the paper?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
		Does the clinical trial adhere to the CONSORT guidelines?
		Do the authors provide sufficient details about the data analysis plan (covariates, selection of statistical tests, and so forth)?
		Are the results of the data analysis clearly presented in the narrative and/or data tables?
<b>Discussion/Conclusion</b>		
		Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by their data?
		Are the findings considered in the context of the existing literature in the discussion section?

**Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:**

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

**Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

**Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper



## JANAC Manuscript Review Templates

### Feature Article: **Review Paper (systematic review with/without meta-analysis, metasynthesis)**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Does the abstract provide a clear overview of the paper in 150 words or less?
		Do the authors provide a list of appropriate key words?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Are 3-6 key considerations, with a focus on clinical considerations, included after the references?
		Are the key considerations more than a rehash or synopsis of the paper?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this review?
		Is the purpose of the review clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Was IRB approval documented or addressed if not indicated?
		Is the design described in sufficient detail in the paper to permit replication?
		Is the review presented in accordance with PRISMA guidelines?
		Are article inclusion and exclusion criteria presented?
		Do the authors provide sufficient detail about the search strategy used for the review?
		Are the dates associated with article retrieval described and appropriate?
		Is the article review process sufficiently described?
		Are the variables associated with data extraction sufficiently described?
		Is the method of data abstraction and synthesis sufficiently described?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
<b>Discussion/Conclusion</b>		
		Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by the data?
		Are the findings considered in the context of the existing literature in the discussion section?

### Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

### Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper

- Areas for improvement

**Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper

## JANAC Manuscript Review Templates

### Feature Article: **Clinical Topic Paper**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Does the abstract provide a clear overview of the paper in 150 words or less?
		Do the authors provide a list of appropriate key words?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Are 3-6 key considerations, with a focus on clinical considerations, included after the references?
		Are the key considerations more than a rehash or synopsis of the paper?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this clinical topic paper?
		Is the purpose of the clinical topic paper clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Was IRB approval documented or addressed if not indicated?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines), if appropriate?
		Is the most recent evidence associated with the clinical issue incorporated into the paper?
		Is the clinical issue comprehensively addressed?
		Is the novelty of the contribution of this paper to existing body of evidence well-articulated?
		Are current treatment guidelines/standards of care (as appropriate) incorporated into paper?
<b>Discussion</b>		
		Is the paper's application/utility made explicit to the practice setting?

### Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

### Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

### Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper



## JANAC Manuscript Review Templates

### Brief: **Qualitative Research Brief, including Pilot Studies**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this research?
		Is the purpose of the research clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Is IRB approval documented?
		Is the design appropriate to the research question?
		Are the recruitment methods described?
		Are the data collection methods described?
		Are the sample and sampling method appropriate to answer the research question?
		Are the dates of data collection included in the paper?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
		Do the authors discuss data saturation?
		Was the approach to data analysis described?
		Do the authors provide details about rigor of qualitative data analysis (credibility, neutrality or confirmability, consistency or dependability, applicability or transferability, trustworthiness)?
		Are the results of the data analysis clearly presented in the narrative and/or data tables?
<b>Discussion</b>		
		Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by their data?
		Are the findings considered in the context of the existing literature?

### Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

### Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

### Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper

## JANAC Manuscript Review Templates

### Brief: **Quantitative Research Brief, including Pilot Studies**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this research?
		Is the purpose of the research clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Is IRB approval documented?
		Is the design appropriate to the research question?
		Are the recruitment methods described?
		Are the data collection methods described?
		Are the sample and sampling method appropriate to answer the research question?
		Are the dates of data collection included in the paper?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
		Is statistical power addressed?
		Are the psychometric properties (reliability/validity) of the instruments described in sufficient detail, as appropriate?
		Do the authors provide details about the data analysis plan (covariates, selection of statistical tests, and so forth)?
		Are statistical tests used appropriately to answer the research question?
		Are the results of the data analysis clearly presented in the narrative and/or data tables?
<b>Discussion</b>		
		Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by their data?
		Are the findings considered in the context of the existing literature?

### Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

### Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

**Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):**

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper

## JANAC Manuscript Review Templates

### Brief: **QI Project Brief**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
<b>Introduction</b>		
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this QI project?
		Is the purpose of the QI project clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
<b>Methods</b>		
		Was IRB approval documented or addressed if not indicated?
		Is the design appropriate to the QI project?
		Is the design described in sufficient detail in the paper to permit replication?
		Are the data collection methods sufficiently described?
		Are the sample and sampling method appropriate to support the QI project?
		Are the dates of data collection included in the paper?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
		Was the QI project completed in accordance with SQUIRE guidelines?
		Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by their data?
		Are the findings considered in the context of the existing literature in the discussion section?

### Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

### Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

### Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper



## JANAC Manuscript Review Templates

### Brief: **Practice, Education, or Program Brief**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this paper?
		Is the purpose of the paper clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
		Are evaluation methods sufficiently described?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?
		Are the authors' conclusions/implications supported by their data?

#### Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

#### Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

#### Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper

## JANAC Manuscript Review Templates

### Brief: **Clinical Case Study**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Is the purpose of the case study clearly stated at the end of the introductory section?
		Is there sufficient background information about the clinical presentation to help the reader understand the chief complaint including signs and symptoms associated with the case?
		Do the authors provide sufficient detail from the clinical examination, including results of diagnostic tests, to help the reader understand the case?
		Do the authors provide a narrative highlighting the conditions considered in the differential diagnosis?
		Do the authors present a plan of care, including follow-up and referral?
		Do the authors include a summary of lessons learned from this case study?
		Do the authors adhere to the systematic approach to reporting about sex and gender in research (SAGER guidelines)?

#### Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

#### Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

#### Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper

## JANAC Manuscript Review Templates

### Brief: **Commentary**

Yes	No	
		Is the title of the paper reflective of the actual content?
		Is the content of the paper timely/relevant?
		Is the paper written according to the rules of grammar, syntax, and sentence/paragraph construction?
		Do the authors provide a clear and concise narrative?
		Is the paper well-constructed with a logical flow?
		Are the references current (within the last 5 years, except for essential classic references) and relevant?
		Do the authors provide sufficient information and support from the existing literature to warrant the need for this commentary?
		Are any key points of view essential to the commentary missing? (If yes, please describe in the comments section.)
		Are the key points of the commentary supported by evidence?

### Rate the overall quality of this paper on a scale of 1-5:

1=excellent

2=good

3=acceptable

4=uncertain of acceptability

5= unacceptable

### Reviewer Blind Comments to Author (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Areas for improvement

### Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor (open box):

- Overall impression
- Strengths of the paper
- Weaknesses of the paper