

© RSNA, 2016

**This reviewer checklist from Radiology is provided as an example. Peer reviewers read and assess the provided manuscript for many issues. Consider the comments from each peer reviewer as a free 3 to 6 hour consultation with a subject matter expert.**

The checklist below is extracted from our editorial “2016: Reviewing for *Radiology*—Reporting Guidelines and Why We Use Them” (Radiology 2016;[doi:10.1148/radiol.2016161204](https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2016161204)). We invite reviewers to use this guide to help focus their reviews.

**MS Number:** \_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

Return your review on time or EARLY  Yes  No

Do you have a conflict of interest?  Yes  No

**Summary** - One-paragraph summary complete? (What was done and found)?  Yes  No

**For the following, please number your comments consecutively, giving page and line numbers where appropriate. Individual comments should be listed as separate line items**

**Major Strengths** listed?  Yes  No

**Major Weaknesses** listed?  Yes  No

**Advances in Knowledge** evaluated?  Yes  No  
 agree  disagree

**Implications for Patient Care** evaluated?  Yes  No  
 agree  disagree

**If the manuscript had a checklist, were all pertinent items addressed?**  Yes  No

**Specific Comments**

Suggestions for improvement?  Yes  No

Concerns or disagreements and reason why?  Yes  No

Items essential but missing from manuscript?  Yes  No

Comments overall: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Abstract**

Appropriate length (typically < 250 words)?  Yes  No

Essential Information in each section?  Yes  No

Purpose clearly stated?  Yes  No

- Purpose same as at the end of introduction?  Yes  No
- Clearly prospective or retrospective?  Yes  No
- Same information as in text?  Yes  No
- Number of patients, age, sex stated?  Yes  No
- Various groups; including controls described?  Yes  No
- Procedures performed described?  Yes  No
- Specifics of evaluation; statistical analyses complete?  Yes  No
- Specific data in Results section?  Yes  No
- Results of statistical evaluations performed?  Yes  No
- Conclusion warranted from data?  Yes  No

Comments on abstract: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### **Introduction**

- Appropriate length (typically < 400 words)?  Yes  No
- Minimal review of literature?  Yes  No
- Logical case for why study was undertaken?  Yes  No
- Appropriate references?  Yes  No
- Clear Hypothesis and purpose of study at end of introduction?  Yes  No
- Misplaced information belonging in different section?  Yes  No

Comments on introduction: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### **Materials and Methods**

- Appropriate length (typically < 800 words)?  Yes  No
- If appropriate, disclosure information provided?  Yes  No
- Human Study - IRB approval stated in 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. Informed consent ?  Yes  No
- Animal Studies - Approval of Institutional animal care committee in 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph?  Yes  No
- When study was done (begin date/end date)  Yes  No
- Patient group fully defined?  Yes  No  
(age, sex, inclusion & exclusion criteria, consecutive or random selection)
- Control patients or volunteers well defined?  Yes  No  
If healthy volunteers are controls, evidence for “healthy” stated?
- Logical presentation of total participants? (consider flow chart)  Yes  No
- Logical division into groups with rationale for division?  Yes  No
- Clear description of procedures performed?  Yes  No
- Number, training, and expertise of persons executing and reading the index tests?  Yes  No
- Were readers appropriately blinded?  Yes  No

- Indicate specifically what was evaluated & how evaluations were performed?  Yes  No
- Statistical methods clearly defined?  Yes  No
- If appropriate, succinct description of theoretical consideration or proposed models?  Yes  No
- Included all items evaluated for which they present results in the Results section?  Yes  No
- Subtitles used and appropriate?  Yes  No
- Misplaced information belonging to another section?  Yes  No

Comments on M&M: \_\_\_\_\_

---

## **Results**

- Appropriate length (typically < 1000 words)?  Yes  No
- Presented results for all items evaluated in M&M?  Yes  No
- Results presented in logical sequence?  Yes  No
- Subtitles used in concert with M&M  Yes  No
- Results for statistical evaluations and significance?  Yes  No
- Numerators & denominators provided for percentages, sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, PPV, NPV in text or tables?  Yes  No
- Misplaced information belonging in another section?  Yes  No
- Consistency between Materials & Methods and Results?  Yes  No

Comments on results: \_\_\_\_\_

---

## **Discussion**

- Appropriate length (typically < 1000 words)?  Yes  No
- Stated pertinent new findings and conclusions?  Yes  No
- Conclusions supported by data?  Yes  No
- Avoided repetition of results?  Yes  No
- Avoided repetition of information already in introduction?  Yes  No
- Avoided presentation of extensive review of topic?  Yes  No
- Presented results and conclusions to other relevant studies?  Yes  No
- Discussion focused and give important findings in context of existing knowledge  Yes  No
- Discussion of limitations and future work to be performed?  Yes  No
- Linked conclusions with purpose?  Yes  No
- If new hypotheses or speculation; warranted and clearly identified?  Yes  No
- Recommendations appropriate and based on study?  Yes  No
- Misplaced information belonging in another section?  Yes  No

Comments on discussion: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix**

Should some material in text be placed in appendix?  Yes  No

Comments on appendix: \_\_\_\_\_

**References**

Listed in order of citation in text?  Yes  No

Adhere to guidelines?  Yes  No

Excessive or outdated?  Yes  No

Important references omitted?  Yes  No

Misquoted or incorrectly cited  Yes  No

Comments on references: \_\_\_\_\_

**Tables**

Needed to display data and simplify text?  Yes  No

Repeat text?  Yes  No

Abbreviations explained?  Yes  No

Numerators and denominators provided?  Yes  No

Title provided for each table?  Yes  No

Numbers in tables correspond to those in text?  Yes  No

Some on-line only?  Yes  No

Comments on tables: \_\_\_\_\_

**Figures**

Are figures of high quality?  Yes  No

Captions clearly state important features?  Yes  No

All labels on illustrations mentioned in caption?  Yes  No

Features mentioned in caption labeled on illustration?  Yes  No

Type of image, contrast used/non-contrast, plane given?  Yes  No

MRI images include pulse sequence information (only needed if not given or different from that in M&M)?  Yes  No

Stain and original magnification given of histology slides?  Yes  No

Too many/redundant illustrations?  Yes  No

Some figures on-line only?  Yes  No

Comments on figures: \_\_\_\_\_