PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE

REVIEWER CHECKLIST FOR ORIGINAL RESEARCH

(Reviewers: Please use the Peer Reviewers Confidential Assessment to provide comments on any items below. For Randomized Controlled Trials, please consult checklist at www.consort-statement.org.)

Yes No NA	
1. 🗌 🔲 🔲	1. Does the paper describe work directed toward the health of a particular
	population?
2.	2. Is <i>Preventing Chronic Disease</i> the right place to publish this study?
3. 🗌 🗎 🖺	3. Does the paper add significantly to what is already known about public
	health interventions?
4. 🔲 🔲 🔲	4. Does the paper present an effective intervention?
5. 🗌 🔲 🔲	5. Is the paper clear, concise, and free of jargon?
6. 🗌 🗎 🗎	6. Is the paper well organized?
7. 🗌 🔲 🔲	7. Does the paper explain why the research project is important?
8. 🗌 🗎 🗎	8. Is the research question clearly stated?
9. 🗌 🗎 🖺	9. Is the study design adequate and appropriate for answering the question?
10. 🗌 🔲 🔲	10. Does the Methods section describe in detail how the research was conducted?
11. 🗌 🔲 🔲	11. If the paper describes human subjects research, does it include a statement
	that research was approved by the appropriate Institutional Review Board?
12. 🗌 🔲 🔲	12. Are study participants appropriate?
13. 🔲 🔲	13. Are study participants adequately described and their conditions defined?
14. 🔲 🔲 🔲	14. If control subjects were used, were they appropriate and adequate?
15. 🔲 🔲 🔲	15. Were exclusion criteria stated and appropriate?
16. 🗌 🔲 🔲	16. Were methods carried out in an ethical manner?
17. 🔲 🔲 🔲	17. Are statements about statistical/analytical methods adequate and complete?
18. 🗌 🔲 🔲	18. Were statistical/analytical methods appropriate?
19. 🔲 🔲 🔲	19. Does the paper present a novel application of an existing statistical/analytical
	method?
20. 🗌 🔲 🔲	20. Does the paper present a new methodological technique?
21. 🗌 🔲 🔲	21. Was the sample size large enough to produce meaningful results?
22. 🔲 🔲 🔲	22. Was the sampling strategy appropriate and adequate for the research
	question?

PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY



23. 🔲 🔲 🔲	23. Was a power calculation done a priori?
24. 🔲 🔲 🔲	24. Was the participation rate satisfactory?
25. 🗌 🔲 🔲	25. Are standard errors and confidence intervals given for main results?
26. 🗌 🔲 🔲	26. Is statistical/analytical material (graphs, charts, tables, grids) well presented?
27. 🔲 🔲 🔲	27. Is the paper of sufficient statistical/analytical quality for publication?
28. 🗌 🔲 🔲	28. If not of sufficient quality, can the paper be revised to become acceptable?
29. 🔲 🔲	29. Are results credible?
30. 🗌 🔲 🔲	30. Are results explained well?
31. 🔲 🔲	31. Does the evidence support conclusions?
32. 🔲 🔲	32. Do conclusions include appropriate caveats?
33. 🔲 🔲	33. Are citations up-to-date and relevant?
34. 🔲 🔲	34. Does the abstract correctly reflect the content of the paper?
35. 🗌 🔲 🔲	35. Are tables and figures appropriate and understandable?
36. 🗌 🔲 🔲	36. Do the authors address future research directions?
37. 🗌 🔲 🔲	37. Are funding sources identified?

PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASE PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH, PRACTICE, AND POLICY

