SCRIPTA MEDICA

FACULTATIS MEDICAE UNIVERSITATIS BRUNENSIS MASARYKIANAE

JOURNAL FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

REVIEW

TITLE OF PAPER: _____

You will be asked to evaluate an article according to the following criteria.

1. ORIGINALITY

	YES	NO
(a) Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to deserve publication?	☐	☐
(b) Does the article comply with the journal's standards?	☐	☐
(c) Is the research question an important one?	☐	☐
(d) If the research has been reviewed previously pass on references to such works to the editor.	☐	☐

2. STRUCTURE

(a) Is the arcicle clearly laid out?	☐	☐
(b) Are all the key elements present (abstract, introduction, materials, and methods, results, conclusion)?	☐	☐
TITLE: Does it clearly describe the article?	☐	☐
ABSTRACT: Does it reflect the content of the article?	☐	☐

INTRODUCTION: The introduction is one to two paragraphs long, as a standard. It summarizes relevant research to provide context. It explains what findings of others, if any, are being challenged or extended.

(a) It should describe the experiment, hypothesis, general experimental design, or method.	☐	☐
(b) Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem under investigation?	☐	☐

METHODOLOGY

(a) Is the methodology appropriate?	☐	☐
(b) Does it explain with sufficient accuracy how the data was collected?	☐	☐
(c) Is the design suitable for answering the question posed?	☐	☐

(d) Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research? ☐ ☐

(e) Does the article identify the procedures followed? ☐ ☐

(f) Are these procedures ordered in a meaningful way? ☐ ☐

(g) If the methods are new, are they explained in sufficient detail? ☐ ☐

(h) Was the collecting of samples appropriate? ☐ ☐

(i) Have the equipment and materials been adequately described? ☐ ☐

(j) Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded? ☐ ☐

(k) Has the author been precise in describing measurements? ☐ ☐

RESULTS

The results should be arranged clearly and in a logical sequence. Here the author should explain in words what (s)he discovered in the research; no interpretations should be included in this section.

(a) Are the statistics correct? ☐ ☐

(b) Has appropriate analysis been conducted? ☐ ☐

If you are not comfortable with statistics, advise the editor when submitting your review.

CONCLUSION/DISCUSSION

(a) Are all statements in this section supported by the respective results? ☐ ☐

(b) Do the statements seem reasonable? ☐ ☐

(c) Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? ☐ ☐

(d) Does the article support or contradict previous theories? ☐ ☐

(e) Does the conclusion explain the contribution of the research to the body of scientific knowledge? ☐ ☐

FIGURES, TABLES, AND GRAPHS

(a) Are they an important part of the paper? ☐ ☐

(b) Do the figures describe the data accurately? ☐ ☐

(c) Are they consistent, e.g. bars in charts are the same width, the scales on the axis are logical, and the like. ☐ ☐

3. LANGUAGE

Correcting English in a paper is not the role of the reviewer.

4. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

a) If the article builds upon previous research, does it refer to that work appropriately? ☐ ☐

b) Are there any essential works that have been omitted? ☐ ☐

c) Are the references accurate? ☐ ☐

5. ETHICAL ISSUES

(a) Plagiarism – if you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of any previous work, let the editor know and please cite the respective previous work.

(b) Fraud – if you suspect that the results in an article are false, let the editor know explaining why you believe the results to be deceitful.

(c) Other ethical concerns – if the research is medical in nature, has confidentiality been maintained? If there has been any violation of accepted norms of ethical treatment of animal or human subjects, these should be identified. The paper should contain statement on written consent being available, if any corresponding experiments were conducted on humans.

YOUR REPORT TO THE EDITOR

When you make a recommendation regarding an article, it is worth considering the categories that an editor will be likely to use for the classification of the article.

(a) Reject (due to poor quality) ☐

(b) Accept without revision ☐

(c) Accept but needs revision ☐

First name, Family name, Title

Full affiliation address with the postcode and country

Date telephone number e-mail signature