

DEVELOPMENTAL MEDICO-LIFE-SCIENCES

Check List for Reviewing an Article

- Please go through the article and comment according to the following guidelines.
- The manuscript being sent for review is a confidential document; hence its contents should not be disclosed, used in any way or discussed with the authors.
- The final decision to accept or reject the manuscript rests with journal Editorial Committee.
- In case a manuscript is rejected, the reviewers are expected to give detailed reasons. If a write-up can be improved, please give detailed recommendations which would help the authors.
- The main idea of your comments is to help the authors to improve upon this manuscript and in the long run, their skill to write future research articles, so please use an encouraging and kind language.
- (Please type 'Yes' or 'No' in the selected column)

Reviewer Name & Address:			
		E-mail:	
Reference No.		Date sent:	Date reviewed:
Title of the Article:			
1. TITLE: Does it convey in a concise manner the following elements? (Type 'Yes' or 'No')			
Primary objective of the study			
Study design			
Running title given or not.			
2. ABSTRACT:			
Is the abstract structured?			
Does the material given under each heading and subheading adequately cover the main features narrated in the main article?			
Are the key words appropriate for the given text and MeSH terms only?			
Any other comments/suggestions?			
3. INTRODUCTION: NEED FOR THE STUDY: Is there a brief description, including the following information, justifying the need to conduct the proposed study?			
the magnitude of the problem in the study population and the work done so far in the area			
the gaps in knowledge, the unanswered questions			
the rationale/justification for the proposed study, the research question and hypothesis			
Is there supportive evidence from the literature or local data justifying the study?			
Is the problem addressed by the study defined clearly?			
Are the research question and hypothesis stated unambiguously?			
Any other comments/suggestions?			
4. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY :			
Is the study focused principally on a single objective?			

If there are multiple objectives, has one of them, directly related to the major focus of the study, been designated as the Primary Objective and others as Secondary and Tertiary Objectives?	
Are the objectives stated precisely and unambiguously and include the following information;	
The research question and hypothesis	
The independent and dependent variables	
The population on whom the study has been implemented	
Are the terms – prevalence, incidence, association, risk, efficacy, safety, effectiveness – used correctly in the context of the proposed study design?	
Any other comments/suggestions?	
5. METHODOLOGY:	
Has the type of the study been correctly mentioned?	
Has ethical clearance been obtained from the institution?	
Source of Data :	
Is the study population been defined clearly?	
Is the duration of data collection indicated?	
Method of collecting data including sampling procedure if, any:	
Is the sample size estimated on a scientific/rational basis? And is the procedure of sample size estimation described adequately?	
Was consent taken from the subjects (sample form given)?	
Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria appropriately listed?	
If an interventional study, is the randomization procedure described?	
Have the comparison groups been defined clearly?	
In case the study involves follow up of recruited participants over a period of time, is the schedule of data collection indicated?	
Is a list of the variables including units used for expressing these provided?	
Are the methods of measurement of the variables spelt out?	
Are statistical measures the investigators have used to analyze the data appropriate?	
Any other comments/suggestions?	
7. RESULTS:	
Is the data presented in explicit way using optimally the Graphics / Illustrations / Photographs?	
Any other comments/suggestions?	
8. DISCUSSION:	

Have the principals, relationship & generalizations been presented?		
Have the exceptions or lack of correlations been pointed out?		
Are implications, limitations and future scope mentioned?		
Any other comments/suggestions?		
9. REFERENCES:		
Are the references listed in the order in which they have been cited in the text? (in Vancouver style)		
Are the references written in the prescribed format and do they cover current literature?		
10. REMARKS: Suitability for publication: (Please type 'X' in the selected column)		
Suitable	Suitable after minor corrections / amendments	Suitable after major correction / amendments
Not Suitable for publishing		
Please give reasons for your decision / point out the deficiencies found;		
Please indicate suggestions for improvement.		
Any other comments/suggestions?		
AUTHORS FEEDBACK ABOUT THE REVIEW ABOVE:		