PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY

• REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR ORIGINAL RESEARCH •

(Reviewers: Please use the Peer Reviewers Confidential Assessment to provide comments on any items below. For Randomized Controlled Trials, please consult checklist at www.consort-statement.org.)

1. 🗖 Yes	D No	1. Does the paper describe work directed toward the health of a particular population?
2. 🛛 Yes	□ No	2. Is <i>Preventing Chronic Disease</i> the right place to publish this study?
3. 🗖 Yes	D No	3. Does the paper add significantly to what is already known about public health interventions?
4. 🛛 Yes	□ No	4. Does the paper present an effective intervention?
5. 🛛 Yes	□ No	5. Is the paper clear, concise, and free of jargon?
6. 🛛 Yes	□ No	6. Is the paper well organized?
7. 🗖 Yes	□ No	7. Does the paper explain why the research project is important?
8. 🛛 Yes	□ No	8. Is the research question clearly stated?
9. 🛛 Yes	□ No	9. Is the study design adequate and appropriate for answering the question?
10. 🗖 Yes	□ No	10. Does the Methods section describe in detail how the research was conducted?
11. 🗖 Yes	D No	11. If the paper describes human subjects research, does it include a statement that research was approved by the appropriate Institutional Review Board?
12. 🗖 Yes	□ No	12. Are study participants appropriate?
13. 🗖 Yes	□ No	13. Are study participants adequately described and their conditions defined?
14. 🗖 Yes	□ No	14. If control subjects were used, were they appropriate and adequate?
15. 🗖 Yes	□ No	15. Were exclusion criteria stated and appropriate?
16. 🗖 Yes	□ No	16. Were methods carried out in an ethical manner?
17. 🗖 Yes	□ No	17. Are statements about statistical/analytical methods adequate and complete?
18. 🗖 Yes	□ No	18. Were statistical/analytical methods appropriate?
19. 🗖 Yes	□ No	19. Does the paper present a novel application of an existing statistical/analytical method?

Reviewer Number:

PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY

• REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR ORIGINAL RESEARCH •

(Reviewers: Please use the Peer Reviewers Confidential Assessment to provide comments on any items below. For Randomized Controlled Trials, please consult checklist at www.consort-statement.org.)

20. 🛛 Yes	□ No	20. Does the paper present a new methodological technique?
21. 🗖 Yes	□ No	21. Was the sample size large enough to produce meaningful results?
22. 🛛 Yes	□ No	22. Was the sampling strategy appropriate and adequate for the research question?
23. 🗖 Yes	□ No	23. Was a power calculation done <i>a priori</i> ?
24. 🗖 Yes	□ No	24. Was the participation rate satisfactory?
25. 🛛 Yes	□ No	25. Are standard errors and confidence intervals given for main results?
26. 🛛 Yes	□ No	26. Is statistical/analytical material (graphs, charts, tables, grids) well presented?
27. 🗖 Yes	□ No	27. Is the paper of sufficient statistical/analytical quality for publication?
28. 🛛 Yes	□ No	28. If not of sufficient quality, can the paper be revised to become acceptable?
29. 🗖 Yes	□ No	29. Are results credible?
30. 🗖 Yes	□ No	30. Are results explained well?
31. 🗖 Yes	□ No	31. Does the evidence support conclusions?
32. 🗖 Yes	□ No	32. Do conclusions include appropriate caveats?
33. 🗖 Yes	□ No	33. Are citations up-to-date and relevant?
34. 🗖 Yes	□ No	34. Does the abstract correctly reflect the content of the paper?
35. 🗖 Yes	□ No	35. Are tables and figures appropriate and understandable?
36. 🗖 Yes	□ No	36. Do the authors address future research directions?
37. 🗖 Yes	□ No	37. Are funding sources identified?

Reviewer Number: