

JGPT Reviewer ‘Read-along’ Template

REVIEW SECTIONS	Does the author need to improve this section? If so, how?
<p>TITLE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concisely & accurately conveys what was done in the study • Includes the population(s) under study (community-dwelling, hospitalized, etc.) • Includes type of study if appropriate (RCT, Systematic Review, etc.) 	
<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concisely & accurately summarizes the study & major findings; avoids excessive detail • Background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identifies the problem ○ States the purpose of the study • Methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ States the study design, population(s), setting(s) if appropriate ○ Explains group allocation if appropriate ○ Identifies all measures used, when & where measures were taken, etc. ○ Describes any intervention(s) provided including mode & dose (frequency, intensity, duration, etc.) ○ Indicates the type of statistical analysis used 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reports statistical significance of results ○ Reports clinical significance of results • Conclusions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Succinctly describes what the major study findings mean ○ Includes a statement of clinical relevance or impact 	
<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-organized; proceeds in a logical sequence to lead the reader to the study purpose and/or hypotheses • Identifies the important problem to be addressed • Demonstrates a strong grasp of the prior literature through a summary description of <i>what is already known</i> • Explains <i>what is NOT known</i> (identifies knowledge gap) • Presents a strong rationale for <i>why it is important to address the knowledge gap</i>; Why is it crucial to conduct this study? • States the purpose(s) of the study; this may include one or more hypotheses to be investigated • Explains why it would be <i>clinically valuable</i> to know the answer(s) to the question(s) 	

METHODS

- Specifies the type of study design
 - Is this the correct design to use to test the hypotheses & answer the question(s)?
 - Retrospective? Prospective?
- Study IRB approved?
- If intervention study (clinical trial), registration number provided?
- Identifies the study population(s)
- Indicates how participants were recruited, & from where
- Presents inclusion and exclusion criteria
- Informed consent obtained?
- If groups were created, how was group allocation accomplished?
 - Was this allocation method free of bias? Does it avoid exerting a systematic influence on the outcome? (e.g., concurrent or consecutive enrollment)
- Reports that the necessary sample size was calculated beforehand ('a priori') in order to achieve a statistical power of at least 0.80 (80%) at a minimum, higher is better.
- Describes each test or measure used to measure or predict outcomes
 - Are standardized measures used?
 - Are client-centered measures used (alone or in combination with other measures; e.g., activity-level, participation level, or QoL measures)?
 - For each measure, is the established validity, reliability,

and Minimal Detectable Change (MDC) reported?

- Describes the testing process
 - When and how many times the tests were conducted
 - Who administered the tests; were they trained to do this?
 - Were testers blinded to group allocation?
- If participants were followed over time, indicates how outcomes were determined (re-testing, telephone interview, diary, review of documentation, etc.)
- Describes the intervention so explicitly it could be replicated (if lengthy, use of appendices or supplemental digital content is acceptable; if previously published, use of citation is acceptable following a brief summary)
 - Includes mode and dose (frequency, intensity and duration)
 - If mode was different between groups, was dose held constant for both groups?
 - Was the dose provided adequate to produce change?
 - Who delivered the intervention? Were they blinded to prior test results? Were they trained to deliver the intervention properly?
- Explains what statistical analyses were used
 - Were these appropriate for the data? Correctly selected?
 - If there were multiple outcome variables, were they analyzed

<p>with a multivariate omnibus test (e.g., MANOVA), followed by univariate tests, followed by post hoc tests? Did they control for baseline differences? For Type I or Family-wise error?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If outcome measures were conducted on multiple occasions, was a repeated measures design used? ○ If there were multiple comparisons or multiple correlations, was statistical correction applied to control error rate (e.g., Bonferroni, Benjamini-Hochberg, etc.)? 	
<p>RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● States results clearly, in a logical & consistent sequence ● Were groups equivalent on all influential characteristics and outcome measures at baseline? If not, was this difference controlled for statistically? ● For each dependent variable, reports the actual statistical power of the analysis to detect differences/associations. If non-significant findings are reported and the power is < 0.80 (80%), the study was underpowered to find differences or associations that may actually exist. ● If this is a RCT or longitudinal study, is a CONSORT (or other similar) flow chart illustrating the progress of participants through the study included? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports statistical significance/non-significance (within- and between-groups) using actual p-values (versus just <0.05 or <0.01; with the exception of <0.001) • Reports clinical significance/non-significance (within- and between-groups); amount of change relative to the MDC or MCID, effect size, etc. • Includes data details in Tables; for each outcome variable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Units of measurement are stated ○ When appropriate, includes means/medians, SDs or SE's, confidence intervals, p-values, power to detect differences/associations; effect sizes, whether or not the MDC was met or exceeded. ○ When appropriate, includes relative risk (RR) or odds ratio (OR) ○ When appropriate, includes AUC, sensitivity, specificity, positive & negative likelihood ratios, positive & negative post-test probabilities • If appropriate, illustrates testing, intervention, and/or results using figures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If graphs, axes are labeled with units of measurement ○ Would additional figures help the reader understand the study better? 	
<p>DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Briefly</u> summarizes the major statistically significant/non-significant and clinically significant/non-significant findings, stating significant findings first. • Relates the findings to the original question(s) or hypotheses 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains the <i>meaning</i> of the findings • Explicitly addresses the clinical implications of the findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How should findings be applied clinically? • Discusses the degree to which these new findings fit with what was already known • If findings different than prior studies, provides possible reasons for the differences • Includes a Limitations section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths of the study ○ Weaknesses of the study, and how these may have influenced study results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources of bias • Suggests possible future research directions 	
<p>CONCLUSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Briefly</u> summarizes the meaning of the findings • Clearly states the clinical relevance of the work 	
<p>REFERENCES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the majority recent (last 10 years)? • Are any important references missing? • Do the references actually support the points made in the text? 	
<p>THROUGHOUT THE MANUSCRIPT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you consider the use of written English in this paper to be “publication ready”? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If not, <i>do not spend a great deal of your time copy-editing the manuscript; tell the author if it is</i> 	

<p><i>inadequate.</i> Provide a few select examples. It is the author's responsibility to have their paper proof-read and copy-edited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Was unsupported opinion and conjecture avoided?• Was there any apparent bias that went unrecognized or wasn't mentioned?• Did each paragraph proceed logically to the next? Or were there 'jumps' from "Point A" to 'Point C' where an interim paragraph would help the reader follow?	
---	--