PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE

REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION PAPERS

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

1. □Yes □No	1. Is the evaluated program clearly described?
2.	2. Does program information describe:
a.	a. The health problem(s) the program was designed to overcome.
b.	b. Extent of the problem for various segments of the population.
c.	c. The determinants of the health problem.
d.	d. The program's target population.
e.	e. The program's goal and objectives.
f.	f. The program's activities and resources.
g.	g. Length of time the program has been in operation.
h.	h. The environment (e.g., political situation, funding issues, community
	support) in which the program operates.
3. □Yes □No	3. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?
4.	4. Are uses for evaluation results clearly stated?
5.	5. Is type of evaluation (e.g., process, outcome) clearly stated?
6.	6. Does the evaluation design suit the evaluation question?
7.	7. Are procedures for gathering data clearly described?
8.	8. Are data-collection instruments and protocols clearly described?
9.	9. Were outcomes to be evaluated clearly defined and measurable?
10. □Yes □No	10. Were baseline data collected?
11. Yes No	11. Were data from the evaluated program compared with data from other
	programs?
12. Yes No	12. If so, were comparisons valid?
13.	13. Were outcomes measured short-, intermediate-, or long-term? (Please circle
	any that apply.)
14. □Yes □No	14. Were methods for collecting evaluation data pilot-tested?
15. Yes No	15. Are numbers of program participants reported?
16. □Yes □No	16. Does the study show numbers and percentages of program participants who
	achieved desired outcomes?
17.	17. Were methods used to analyze data appropriate?

PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY



18.	18. Were the data stratified by demographic variables (race, sex, age, income,
	geographic area)?
19. 🗌 Yes 🗌 No	19. If so, were variables appropriate and adequate?
20. Yes No	20. Are evaluation conclusions justified?
21. Yes No	21. Were alternative conclusions considered?
22. Yes No	22. Were evaluation results compared with previously published study results?
23. Yes No	23. Were actual results compared with intended results?
24. Yes No	24. Were program results for one year compared with results of another year?
25. Yes No	25. Were results compared with national objectives (e.g., those in <i>Healthy</i>
	People 2010)?
26. Yes No	26. Are potential biases documented?
27. Yes No	27. Were limitations of the evaluation examined?
28. Yes No	28. Are lessons learned as a result of the evaluation discussed?
29. Yes No	29. Can evaluation results possibly be misinterpreted?
30. Yes No	30. Has the program made any changes as a result of the evaluation?
31. Yes No	31. Is the evaluation question fully answered?

