

# PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE

## PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY

### • REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR COMMUNITY CASE STUDIES •

1.  Yes  No
2.  Yes  No
3.  Yes  No
4.  Yes  No
5.  Yes  No
6.  Yes  No
7.  Yes  No
8.  Yes  No
9.  Yes  No

1. Does this article describe a disease prevention activity, such as a community program, community-based intervention or evaluation, or field observation?
2. Does the program illustrate the transition from research to practice?
3. Does it offer specific ways to improve the program?
4. Does it emphasize the context (community) in which the activity occurs?
5. Does it offer special insight and commentary?
6. Does it add to what is already known about public health practice?
7. Does it fit the scope of *PCD*?
8. Is the purpose and function of the program or evaluation clear?
9. Is the article divided into the following sections: *Background*, *Context*, *Methods*, *Consequences* and *Interpretation*?

#### ***Background***

1.  Yes  No
2.  Yes  No

1. Does *Background* provide scientific knowledge on the disease and the intervention?
2. Does this section include references?

#### ***Context***

1.  Yes  No
2.  Yes  No
3.  Yes  No
4.  Yes  No

1. Does *Context* adequately describe the community?
2. Does it outline the characteristics of the local population?
3. Does it describe other community aspects (such as economic base, recreational facilities, diet, or support systems) that might be relevant to the program described?
4. Does it explain why the health problem addressed is so prevalent in this community?

# PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE

## PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY

### • REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR COMMUNITY CASE STUDIES •

1.  Yes  No
2.  Yes  No
3.  Yes  No
4.  Yes  No
5.  Yes  No
6.  Yes  No

#### ***Methods***

1. Does *Methods* describe the program, activities, or intervention?
2. Does it provide a timeline?
3. Does this section describe how participants are recruited?
4. Does it describe staffing skills required?
5. Does it describe materials used to educate or reward participants?
6. Does it describe how the program was evaluated?

1.  Yes  No
2.  Yes  No
3.  Yes  No
4.  Yes  No
5.  Yes  No

#### ***Consequences***

1. Does *Consequences* provide details on what got better, what got worse, and how things changed?
2. Does it describe barriers or advantages encountered especially unexpected ones?
3. Does it describe what was learned through evaluation or field observation?
4. Does it describe what actions were taken on the basis of the findings?
5. Does it describe how feedback was provided to the community?

1.  Yes  No
2.  Yes  No
3.  Yes  No
4.  Yes  No

#### ***Interpretation***

1. Does *Interpretation* adequately support material in the report?
2. Was the activity worthwhile?
3. Does the article demonstrate how context affected consequences?
4. Does it offer advice to other communities that might be interested in setting up a similar program?