

PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE

PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY

• REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR SPECIAL TOPICS •

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 1. Does the paper describe work directed toward the health of a particular population? |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 2. Is <i>Preventing Chronic Disease</i> the right place to publish this article? |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 3. Does the paper add significantly to what is already known about public health practice? |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 4. Does it raise issues of importance to researchers or practitioners? |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 5. Does it provide a unique, unusual, or new perspective? |
| 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 6. Is the paper clear, concise, and free of jargon? |
| 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 7. Is the paper well organized? |
| 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 8. Is the paper especially timely? |
| 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 9. Does the author present a good argument? |
| 10. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 10. Is the author's reasoning justified with evidence? |
| 11. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 11. If statistics were used, were statistical/analytical methods appropriate and adequately described? |
| 12. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 12. If a sample population was described, was the sample size large enough to produce meaningful results? |
| 13. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 13. Is statistical/analytical material (graphs, charts, tables, grids) well presented? |
| 14. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 14. Is the paper of sufficient statistical/analytical quality for publication? |
| 15. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 15. If not of sufficient quality, can the paper be revised to become acceptable? |
| 16. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 16. If the author presents a methodology, was it adequately and completely described? |
| 17. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 17. If results are presented, are they credible? |
| 18. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 18. Are results explained well? |
| 19. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 19. Does the evidence support conclusions? |
| 20. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 20. Do conclusions include appropriate caveats? |

For PCD Office Use Only
Manuscript Number:

Reviewer Number:

PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE

PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY

• REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR SPECIAL TOPICS •

- 21. Yes No
- 22. Yes No
- 23. Yes No
- 24. Yes No
- 25. Yes No

- 21. Are citations up-to-date and relevant?
- 22. Does the abstract correctly reflect the content of the paper?
- 23. Are tables and figures appropriate and understandable?
- 24. Do the authors address future research directions?
- 25. Are funding sources identified?