PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE

REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR COMMUNITY CASE STUDIES

(Instructions for Reviewers: Please include this checklist with your Manuscript Evaluation.)

1. 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. Yes No	2. Does the program illustrate the transition from research to practice?
3. Yes No	3. Does it offer specific ways to improve the program?
4. Yes No	4. Does it emphasize the context (community) in which the activity occurs?
5. Yes No	5. Does it offer special insight and commentary?
6. Yes No	6. Does it add to what is already known about public health practice?
7. Yes No	7. Does it fit the scope of <i>PCD</i> ?
8. Yes No	8. Is the purpose and function of the program or evaluation clear?
9. Yes No	9. Is the article divided into the following sections: Background, Context,
	Methods, Consequences and Interpretation?
	Background
1. Yes No	1. Does <i>Background</i> provide scientific knowledge on the disease and the
	intervention?
2. Yes No	2. Does this section include references?
	Context
1. Yes No	1. Does <i>Context</i> adequately describe the community?
2. Yes No	2. Does it outline the characteristics of the local population?
3. Yes No	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. 🗌 Yes 🗌 No	4. Does it explain why the health problem addressed is so prevalent in this
	community?
	Methods
1. 🗌 Yes 🗌 No	1. Does <i>Methods</i> describe the program, activities, or intervention?
2. 🗌 Yes 🗌 No	2. Does it provide a timeline?
1	

PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY



- 3. Yes No
- 4. Yes No
- 5. Yes No
- 6. Yes No
- 1. Yes 🗌 No

2. Yes No

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

- 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?

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?

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?

PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY

