

Journals rely on peer reviewers as a cornerstone of a paper's evaluation. Peer reviewing involves critical appraisal of each submission and is a service to the discipline.<sup>1-3</sup> The goal of peer review is to improve the quality of a paper.<sup>1-5</sup>

## General Comments:

Succinct summary of review.  
Is the writing clear and organized?  
Is the manuscript relevant to academic family medicine?  
Are any of the facts stated incorrect?  
Is all important material included?

## Considerations by Section:


**Title:** Does it describe the paper well? Does it hook the reader?  
**Abstract:** Does it summarize the article well?  
**Introduction:** Does it include a rationale? Is pertinent literature included?  
**Methods:** Can they be reproduced? Did the authors collect a representative sample? Did they account for diversity in their sample? Do the statistics make sense?  
**Results:** Are the results presented clearly, concisely, and accurately?  
**Discussion/Conclusions:** Are they supported by the results? Any inappropriate or overstated conclusions?  
**References:** Are they current and relevant? Are pertinent articles missing?  
**Tables/Figures:** Do they add value to the manuscript and represent the data concisely and accurately?

## Other Comments:

Are there specific areas of concern?

## Reviewer Recommendation to Editor:

Accept	Major Revision
Minor Revision	Rejection



## Peer-Review Best Practices:

- Review structure can vary. One method is to arrange comments by section, starting with overall comments. Another is to use bullet points or numbered lists to identify areas of concern.
- Comments to editor are NOT shared with the author and can provide a venue to share feedback about the paper that you do not want the author to see.
- Editors appreciate specific feedback when possible. Why do you recommend acceptance, revision, or rejection? Can you give examples?
- Consider reviews as a form of mentorship for authors. The goal is to improve this and future submissions.<sup>1</sup>
  - Be constructive, honest, fair, and polite.<sup>4</sup>
  - Recusing yourself as a reviewer is appropriate if concern for inability to provide professional feedback or a conflict of interest.<sup>4</sup>
- Comment on the originality and usefulness of the manuscript for the readership.<sup>2</sup>
- Evaluate manuscripts confidentially.<sup>2,4</sup>
- Complete the review in a timely manner.<sup>1,2,4,5</sup>
- Recommending rejection is okay.<sup>2</sup>
  - Some manuscripts do not meet criteria for publication.
  - When in doubt, ask yourself, "can my concerns with this manuscript be rectified with a revision?" If the answer is no, consider recommending rejection.
- Completing peer reviews is a great way to learn critical appraisal and improve writing skills.

Contact Author: [jason.frasca@hotmail.com](mailto:jason.frasca@hotmail.com)

## References:

- Reviewer training materials. *BMJ*. Accessed August 22, 2023. <https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-reviewers/training-materials>
- Allen H, Cury A, Gaston T, Graf C, Wakley H, Willis M. What does better peer review look like? Underlying principles and recommendations for better practice. *Learned Publishing*. 2019;32(2):163-175. doi:10.1002/leap.1222
- Anderson LN, Ledford CJW. Who's guarding the gate? The reach of prereviewed emerging science and implications for family medicine education. *Fam Med*. 2021;53(8):670-675. doi:10.22454/FamMed.2021.246112
- ICMJE | Recommendations | Responsibilities in the Submission and Peer-Review Process. [www.icmje.org](http://www.icmje.org). <https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/responsibilities-in-the-submission-and-peer-review-process.html#three>. Accessed June 13, 2023
- Iwaz J. To my reviewers, with respect and gratitude: Guidelines from an author. *Learned Publishing*. 2022;35(4):674-677. doi:10.1002/leap.1484