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What is a “Peer reviewed“ or “refereed ”journal?
Definition

- A scholarly journal requires that each article submitted for publication be judged by an independent panel of experts or scholarly/scientific peers.

- Articles not approved by a majority of these peers are not accepted for publication by the journal.

- Peer review is a well-accepted indicator of quality scholarship.
Many scholarly journals use a process of peer-review prior to publishing an article, whereby other scholars in the author's field or specialty (his or her peers) critically assess a draft of the article.

Peer-reviewed journals (also called refereed journals) are scholarly journals that only publish articles that have passed through this review process.
What is the purpose of peer-reviewed articles?

- These articles present the best and most authoritative information that disciplines have to offer. The review process helps ensure that the published articles reflect solid scholarship in their fields.

- Through the careful use of citations, a peer-reviewed article allows anyone who reads it to examine the bases of the claims made in the article.

- One drawback to the peer-review process is that articles may not appear for one or two years after they are written. For this reason they are not the best sources to seek for hot, news-driven topics.
Characteristics of scholarly, peer-reviewed, or refereed journals

• Formal in format
• Authors are scholars and researchers in the field and are identified as such purpose of the article is to publish the results of research
• Sources are cited with footnotes or a bibliography at the end of the article
• Publisher may be a professional organization or research institution; usually not-for-profit
• Very little advertising
• Graphics are usually statistical illustrations, in black-and-white
What will they look like?

The presence of the following traits often indicates that an article is peer-reviewed:

– An Abstract (brief description of the article)
– The organization of the article into distinct sections such as Methodology, Results, and Conclusion
– Charts, tables, or graphs
– A lot of citations: these may appear in-text, and/or as footnotes, endnotes, works cited, reference list, bibliography
– Complex, formal language that is specific to the field
– Notes indicating when article was submitted and when it was accepted
How to be sure?

• If you want to be certain that the journal in which the article appears is peer-reviewed, you can explore the website of the journal on the Internet.

• Look for a link to information for the author or in the About Us link.

• Peer-reviewed journals are usually proud to announce that they are peer-reviewed.
Author’s instructions on the AJN website

http://journals.lww.com/ajnonline/Pages/informationforauthors.aspx

Click on Information for Authors

Then click on Instructions and Guidelines
Author’s instructions on the AJN website (continued)

Writing for the American Journal of Nursing: Author Guidelines

AJN is a peer-reviewed journal that follows publishing standards set by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE; [www.icmje.org](http://www.icmje.org)), the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME; [www.wame.org](http://www.wame.org)), and the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE; [www.publicationethics.org.uk](http://www.publicationethics.org.uk)).

AJN’s mission is to promote excellence in nursing and health care through the dissemination of evidence-based, peer-reviewed clinical information and original research, discussion of relevant and controversial professional issues, adherence to the standards of journalistic integrity and excellence, and promotion of nursing perspectives to the health care community and the public.

AJN welcomes submissions of evidence-based clinical application and review papers, descriptions of best clinical practices, original research reports, case studies, narratives,
Some databases identify peer reviewed articles or allow you to limit your search to find them.

- When searching full-text databases such as PROQUEST, a search can be limited to peer-reviewed or refereed sources simply by checking a box on the search screen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Databases</th>
<th>E-Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLINICAL KEY</td>
<td>OvidSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMJ</td>
<td>Scopus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UpToDate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrich</td>
<td>OLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest</td>
<td>Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Online Library</td>
<td>ScienceDirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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protein in the diet

Search subject areas List view

Learn about the ProQuest platform

- Search the online Help.
- Discover answers to common questions at ProQuest's Product Support Center.
- Contact Support if you need further assistance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impaired Bone Formation with a High-Protein Diet in Rats with Adriamycin-Induced Nephrotic Syndrome</td>
<td>Lim, A; Young, Kim; Su Yeon; Lee, H; Sedic, Ghoul; Pyonwon</td>
<td>Kidney &amp; Blood Pressure Research; Basel 35.6 (Feb 2013): 438-44.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Protein quantity, not protein quality, accelerates whole-body leucine kinetics and the acute-phase response during acute infection in marasmic Malawian children</td>
<td>Manary, M; J; Yarasheski, K E; Smith, S; Abrams, E T; Hart, C A</td>
<td>The British Journal of Nutrition; Cambridge 92.4 (Oct 2004): 589-95.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Systemic Glucose Level Changes With A Carbohydrate Restricted and Higher Protein Diet Combined With Exercise</td>
<td>Brandon, Robin G; Calo-Lebanon, Rate A; Calo, A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PubMed is much larger than Proquest. Because most journals indexed in PubMed are peer-reviewed, limiting your search to peer-reviewed articles is not an option.

With a little extra research, you can confirm that the journal the article appears in is peer-reviewed.

Look for a link to “Information for the Author” or in the “About Us” link on the journal’s website as discussed previously.
PubMed

PubMed comprises more than 26 million citations for biomedical literature from MEDLINE, life science journals, and online books. Citations may include links to full-text content from PubMed Central and publisher web sites.

Using PubMed
- PubMed Quick Start Guide
- Full Text Articles
- PubMed FAQs
- PubMed Tutorials
- New and Noteworthy

PubMed Tools
- PubMed Mobile
- Single Citation Matcher
- Batch Citation Matcher
- Clinical Queries
- Topic-Specific Queries

More Resources
- MeSH Database
- Journals in NCBI Databases
- Clinical Trials
- E-Utilities (API)
- LinkOut

Latest Literature
Trending Articles
PubMed Commons
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Search results

Items: 1 to 20 of 18745

1. The impact of age on Pru p 3 IgE production in Italy.
   Ciprandi C, De Amici M, Di Martino ML, Barocchi P, Comite P.
   PMID: 28154805

2. Involvment of cross-reactive carbohydrate determinants-specific IgE in pollen allergy testing.
   PMID: 28154803

Related searches
- birch pollen allergy
- grass pollen allergy
- bee pollen allergy
- cedar pollen allergy
- pollen allergy treatment
BACKGROUND: Pollen allergy may be frequently associated with fruit-vegetables: the so-called pollen food syndrome. Pru p 3 is the most relevant peach allergen. Previously, it has been reported that serum specific IgE level to Pru p 3 depends on age in a limited geographic area.

OBJECTIVE: This study aimed to test the hypothesis about the differences of Pru p 3 sensitization across Italy, mainly concerning the impact of age.

METHODS: The current study was retrospective and multicentre, involving 2 labs in Northern Italy (709 subjects), 1 in Genoa (1,040 subjects), and 1 in Southern Italy (2,188 subjects). All of them referred to labs for IgE testing because of suspected food allergy. Serum IgE to Pru p 3 was assessed in all subjects.

RESULTS: Sixteen point seven percent (16.7%) of subjects were sensitized to Pru p 3. Sensitization percentage significantly decreased over time. The serum IgE levels increased up to young adulthood and then decreased until aging.

CONCLUSION: Our experience demonstrates that Pru p 3 sensitization and production are closely age-dependent phenomena.
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Instructions for Authors

1. Journal Publication Policies and Procedures

Asia Pacific Allergy (AP Allergy) has agreed to follow the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals (the "Uniform Requirements") of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), the full text of which is available at http://www.icmje.org. Instructions are consistent with the March 2009 version of the Uniform Requirements. Each author is responsible for fully understanding all requirements listed below.

Authors must submit all manuscripts electronically. To submit a manuscript, please prepare it according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation.

A. Authorship and Contributorship

AP Allergy defines an "author" as a person whose participation in the work is sufficient for taking public responsibility for all portions of the content. Specifically, all authors should have made substantial contributions to all of the following:

1. conception and design of the study; acquisition of the data; or analysis and interpretation of the data.
2. drafting of the article or critical revision of the article for important intellectual content; and
3. final approval of the version to be submitted.

When authorship is attributed to a group, all authors must meet the listed criteria and must be responsible for the quality, accuracy, and ethics of the work. All authors must participate in determining the order of authorship.

B. Ethics

For submission to AP Allergy, studies on human beings must comply with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and its recommendations guiding physicians in biomedical research involving human subjects (adopted by the 18th World Medical Assembly, Helsinki, Finland, June 1964 and amended by the 26th World Medical Assembly, Tokyo, Japan, October 1975; the 35th World Medical Assembly, Venice, Italy, October 1983; and the 41st World Medical Assembly, Hong Kong, September 1989). To satisfy this requirement, authors must obtain appropriate informed consent from the study subjects. Investigational protocols must have been reviewed and approved by a formally constituted IRB for human studies. Authors must state in the Methods section that they have received IRB approval for their study or have received a statement from the IRB that IRB approval was unnecessary. In the submission of selected series such as case reports that have no Methods.
1. Tables and Figures
Each table should fit within a single page. The table legend may include any pertinent notes and must include definitions of all abbreviations and acronyms used in the Table. For footnotes, the following symbols should be used in this order: *, †, ‡, §, ¶, ††, ‡‡, etc. The significance of observations must be indicated by appropriate statistical analyses.

Figures are to be cited consecutively, using Arabic numerals. Recommended fonts within figures are Helvetica and Arial. Figures that are drawn or photographed professionally should be sent as JPEG or PPT files. Authors should review the images of the files on a computer screen to ensure that they meet their own quality standards.

J. Legends for Tables and Illustrations
Legends should be double-spaced and should begin on a separate page, with Arabic numerals corresponding to the Tables or Illustrations. When symbols, arrows, numbers, or letters are used to identify parts of a Table or Illustration, they should be individually identified and clearly explained in the legend.

K. Abbreviations
Authors should limit the use of abbreviations to an absolute minimum. Abbreviations are not to be used in titles and abstract. Each abbreviation must be defined the first time it is used.

L. Units of Measurement
Measurements of length, height, weight, and volume should be reported in metric units (meter, kilogram, or liter, or their decimal multiples). Temperature should be in degrees Celsius.

M. Suggestions for Peer Reviewers
Authors may provide the names, affiliations, and e-mail addresses for up to five potential peer reviewers. These individuals should not be recent collaborators or coauthors and should not have provided substantial advice or critiques to the authors in the context of their work. The editors will consider these suggestions when selecting reviewers.

N. Page Proofs
Asia Pacific Allergy will provide the corresponding author with galleys proofs for review/correction. Corresponding authors will receive a PDF file of the typeset pages to check the copyediting before publication. Corrections should be kept to a minimum. Within 48 hours, changes to page proofs should be sent by e-mail or signed proofs should be sent by fax to the Asia Pacific Allergy Editorial Office. The corresponding author may contact the Editorial Office, depending on the nature of the correction to the proof. Failure to return the proof to the Editorial Office within 48 hours may necessitate rescheduling publication for a subsequent issue.

O. Reprints
The reprint order form must be returned along with the corrected galley proofs. Purchased reprints are normally shipped 3 weeks after publication of the journal.

P. Page Charges
Minimum publication charges and additional fees for reprints will be due on every manuscript. Color illustrations are charged to the authors.

III. Editorial Policy
The editor assumes that on submission of a manuscript, all listed authors have agreed with the following Asia Pacific Allergy instructions.
Major article sections

• **Abstract** -- brief summary of entire article
• **Introduction** -- includes literature review; states why the research is relevant.
• **Methods** -- identifies how patients were selected, what study procedures entailed, and statistical methods used.
• **Results** -- presents objective results
• **Discussion** -- interprets results; states study strengths/weaknesses; identifies future work
Peer review

• Peer review in all its form plays an important role in ensuring the integrity of the scholarly record. The process depends to a large extent on trust, and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically.
Basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere

Peer reviewers should:

1. • only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner

2. • respect the confidentiality of peer review and not reveal any details of a manuscript or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond those that are released by the journal

3. • not use information obtained during the peer-review process for their own or any other person’s or organization’s advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others

4. • declare all potential conflicting interests, seeking advice from the journal if they are unsure whether something constitutes a relevant interest
Cont; Basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere

5. not allow their reviews to be influenced by the origins of a manuscript, by the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, or by commercial considerations

6. • be objective and constructive in their reviews, refraining from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libelous or derogatory personal comments

7. • acknowledge that peer review is largely a reciprocal endeavor and undertake to carry out their fair share of reviewing and in a timely manner

8. • provide journals with personal and professional information that is accurate and a true representation of their expertise

9. • recognize that impersonation of another individual during the review process is considered serious misconduct
Expectations during the peer-review process

1. On being approached to review
2. During review
3. When preparing the report
4. Expectations post review
On being approached to review

Peer reviewers should:

1. respond in a **reasonable time-frame**, especially if they cannot do the review, and without intentional delay.
2. declare if they do not have the **subject expertise** required to carry out the review or if they are able to assess only part of the manuscript, outlining clearly the areas for which they have the relevant expertise.
3. only agree to review a manuscript if they are fairly confident they can return a review within the proposed or mutually agreed time-frame, informing the journal promptly if they require an extension.
4. declare any potentially conflicting or competing interests (which may, for example, be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious), seeking advice from the journal if they are unsure whether something constitutes a relevant interest.
cont; On being approached to review

5. follow journals’ policies on situations they consider to represent a conflict to reviewing. If no guidance is provided, they should inform the journal if: they work at the same institution as any of the authors (or will be joining that institution or are applying for a job there); they are or have been recent (e.g. within the past 3 years) mentors, mentees, close collaborators or joint grant holders; they have a close personal relationship with any of the authors.

6. review afresh any manuscript they have previously reviewed for another journal as it may have changed between the two submissions and the journals’ criteria for evaluation and acceptance may be different.

7. ensure suggestions for alternative reviewers are based on suitability and not influenced by personal considerations or made with the intention of the manuscript receiving a specific outcome (either positive or negative).

8. decline to review if they have issues with the peer-review model used by a journal (e.g. it uses open review and releases the reviewers’ names to the authors) that would either affect their review or cause it to be invalidated because of their inability to comply with the journal’s review policies.
On being approached to review

9. not agree to review a manuscript just to gain sight of it with no intention of submitting a review.

10. decline to review if they feel unable to provide a fair and unbiased review.

11. decline to review if they have been involved with any of the work in the manuscript or its reporting.

12. decline to review if asked to review a manuscript that is very similar to one they have in preparation or under consideration at another journal.
During review

1. notify the journal immediately and seek advice if they discover either a conflicting interest that wasn’t apparent when they agreed to the review or anything that might prevent them providing a fair and unbiased review.

2. refrain from looking at the manuscript and associated material while awaiting instructions from a journal on issues that might cause the request to review to be rescinded.

3. read the manuscript, ancillary material (e.g. reviewer instructions, required ethics and policy statements, supplemental data files) and journal instructions thoroughly, getting back to the journal if anything is not clear and requesting any missing or incomplete items they need to carry out a full review.

4. notify the journal as soon as possible if they find they do not have the expertise to assess all aspects of the manuscript; they shouldn’t wait until submitting their review as this will unduly delay the review process.
Cont; During review

5. not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript, including junior researchers they are mentoring, without first obtaining permission from the journal; the names of any individuals who have helped them with the review should be included with the returned review so that they are associated with the manuscript in the journal’s records and can also receive due credit for their efforts.

6. keep all manuscript and review details confidential

7. contact the journal if circumstances arise that will prevent them from submitting a timely review, providing an accurate estimate of the time they will need to do a review if still asked to do so.

8. in the case of double-blind review, if they suspect the identity of the author(s) notify the journal if this knowledge raises any potential conflict of interest.
Cont; During review

9. notify the journal immediately if they come across any irregularities, have concerns about ethical aspects of the work, are aware of substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article, or suspect that misconduct may have occurred during either the research or the writing and submission of the manuscript; reviewers should, however, keep their concerns confidential and not personally investigate further unless the journal asks for further information or advice.

10. not intentionally prolong the review process, either by delaying the submission of their review or by requesting unnecessary additional information from the journal or author.

11. ensure their review is based on the merits of the work and not influenced, either positively or negatively, by any personal, financial, or other conflicting considerations or by intellectual biases.

12. not contact the authors directly without the permission of the journal.
When preparing the report

1. bear in mind that the **editor is looking to them for subject knowledge, good judgment, and an honest and fair assessment** of the strengths and weaknesses of the work and the manuscript.

2. make clear at the start of their review if they **have been asked to address only specific parts or aspects of a manuscript** and indicate which these are.

3. follow journals’ instructions on the specific feedback that is required of them and, unless there are good reasons not to, the way this should be organized.

4. be **objective and constructive in their reviews** and provide feedback that will help the authors to improve their manuscript.

5. **not make derogatory personal** comments or unfounded accusations.

6. be **specific in their criticisms, and provide evidence** with appropriate references to substantiate general statements such as, ‘this work has been done before’, to help editors in their evaluation and decision and in fairness to the authors.

7. **remember it is the authors’ paper and not attempt to rewrite it to their own preferred style** if it is basically sound and clear; suggestions for changes that improve clarity are, however, important.

8. be **aware of the sensitivities surrounding language issues** that are due to the authors writing in a language that is not their own, and phrase the feedback appropriately and with due respect.
Cont; When preparing the report

1. make clear which suggested additional investigations are essential to support claims made in the manuscript under consideration and which will just strengthen or extend the work.

2. not prepare their report in such a way or include comments that suggest the review has been done by another person.

3. not prepare their report in a way that reflects badly or unfairly on another person.

4. not make unfair negative comments or include unjustified criticisms of any competitors’ work that is mentioned in the manuscript.

5. ensure their comments and recommendations for the editor are consistent with their report for the authors; most feedback should be put in the report for the authors.

6. confidential comments to the editor should not be a place for denigration or false accusation, done in the knowledge that the authors will not see these comments.

7. not suggest that authors include citations to the reviewer’s (or their associates’) work merely to increase the reviewer’s (or their associates’) citation count or to enhance the visibility of their or their associates’ work; suggestions must be based on valid academic or technological reasons.

8. determine whether the journal allows them to sign their reviews and, if it does, decide as they feel comfortable doing.

9. if they are the editor handling a manuscript and decide themselves to provide a review of that manuscript, do this transparently and not under the guise of an anonymous review if the journal operates blind review; providing a review for a manuscript being handled by another editor at the journal can be treated as any other review
Expectations post review

1. continue to keep details of the manuscript and its review confidential.

2. respond promptly if contacted by a journal about matters related to their review of a manuscript and provide the information required.

3. contact the journal if anything relevant comes to light after they have submitted their review that might affect their original feedback and recommendations.

4. read the reviews from the other reviewers, if these are provided by the journal, to improve their own understanding of the topic or the decision reached.

5. try to accommodate requests from journals to review revisions or resubmissions of manuscripts they have reviewed.
Authorship

Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), also known as the Vancouver group.

The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:
1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Contributors who meet fewer than all 4 of the above criteria for authorship should not be listed as authors, but they should be acknowledged. Examples of activities that alone (without other contributions) do not qualify a contributor for authorship are acquisition of funding; general supervision of a research group or general administrative support; and writing assistance, technical editing, language editing, and proofreading.
Authorship

This is hardly surprising given the enormous pressure on individuals and institutions to “publish or perish.” Thus the principles laid down by editors are often breached and by-lines often do not reflect who really did the work.

Many people (both editors and investigators) feel that this misrepresentation is a form of research misconduct, and that honesty in reporting science should extend to authorship. They argue that, if scientists are dishonest about their relationship to their work, this undermines confidence in the reporting of the work itself.
Authorship

• People generally lie about authorship in two ways:
  a) by putting down names of people who took little or no part in the research (gift authorship)
  B) by leaving out names of people who did take part (ghost authorship).

Preventing a problem is often better than solving it. We recommend the following three principles.
we recommend the following three: principles:

• Encourage a culture of ethical authorship
• Start discussing authorship when you plan your research
• Decide authorship before you start each article
How to handle authorship disputes when they occur

• (a) Disputes
• (b) Misconduct
What you can do if authorship issues are not resolved

- before it is submitted so you can withdraw your name.
- If your name is included on a publication against your wishes:
- if your name is wrongly omitted:
• Ghost authors (professional writers, not listed as authors): contact the editor-in-chief by documents

• Gift or guest authors: who did not make a significant contribution to the research and therefore do not fulfill the ICMJE criteria

• Group authorship:

• Guarantor:
• **Order of authors:** The ICMJE guidelines state that the order of authorship, should be ‘a joint decision of the co-authors.'
Guidelines for Reviewing

Look for the “intellectual plot-line” of the article.
ask the major questions that are central to the review process:
1. What is the purpose of this article?
2. Why is it important to investigate or examine the subject of the article?
3. How are the authors carrying out the task? Are their methods and comments appropriate and adequate to the task?
4. What do they claim to have found out? Are the findings clearly stated?
5. How does this advance knowledge in the field?
Actions to Take reviewing

1. Skim the article without taking notes:
2. Re-read the article more carefully:
3. Read the “Materials and Methods” and “Results” sections multiple times:
4. Before you begin the first draft of your summary:
5. Write a draft of your summary:
1. Skim the article without taking notes:

- Read the abstract. The abstract will tell you the major findings of the article and why they matter.
- Read first for the “big picture.”
- Note any terms or techniques you need to define.
- Jot down any questions or parts you don’t understand.
- If you are unfamiliar with any of the key concepts in the article, look them up in a textbook.
2. Re-read the article more carefully:

- Pay close attention to the “Materials and Methods” (please note that in some journals this section is at the very end of the paper) and “Results” sections.
- Ask yourself questions about the study, such as:
  - Was the study repeated?
  - What was the sample size? Is this representative of the larger population?
  - What variables were held constant? Was there a control?
  - What factors might affect the outcome?
3. Read the “Materials and Methods” and “Results” sections multiple times:

Carefully examine the graphs, tables, and diagrams.

면서 Try to interpret the data first before reading the captions and details.

Make sure you understand the article fully.
4. Before you begin the first draft of your summary:

- Try to describe the article in your own words first.
- Try to distill the article down to its “scientific essence.”
- Include all the key points and be accurate.
- A reader who has not read the original article should be able to understand your summary.
5. Write a draft of your summary:

- Don’t look at the article while writing, to make it easier to put the information in your own words and avoid unintentional plagiarism.
- Refer back to the article later for details and facts.
- Ask yourself questions as you write:
  1. What is the purpose of the study? What questions were asked?
  2. How did the study address these questions?
  3. What assumptions did the author make?
  4. What were the major findings?
  5. What surprised you or struck you as interesting?
  6. What questions are still unanswered?
Format

• A complete citation of the article goes at the top of the page, below your heading.
• ⬤ Don’t skip a line between the citation and the start of the essay.
• ⬤ Indent the first line of the essay.
• ⬤ Be concise and eliminate superfluous information
Critique: A Critical Review and Assessment of the Article

• Include a summary as well as your own analysis and evaluation of the article.

• Know the article thoroughly.

• Do not include personal opinions.

• Be sure to distinguish your thoughts from the author’s words.

• Focus on the positive aspects and what the author(s) of the study learned.

• Note limitations of the study at the end of the essay:
  • Do the data and conclusions contradict each other?
  • Is there sufficient data to support the author’s generalizations?
  • What questions remain unanswered?
  • How could future studies be improved?
writing style

Consider the three guidelines for successful communication—to be clear, concise, and correct—and whether the authors have achieved it:

1. **Is the writing clear?** Do the authors communicate their ideas using direct, straightforward, and unambiguous words and phrases? Have they avoided jargon (statistical or conceptual) that would interfere with the communication of their procedures or ideas? Have they clearly and satisfactorily explained the key concepts relevant to the article?

2. **Is the writing concise?** Are too many words or paragraphs or sections used to present what could be communicated more simply?
3. Is the writing correct? Many writers have only a rudimentary grasp of grammar and punctuation, and that results in meandering commas, clauses in complex sentences that are struggling to find their verbs, and adjectives or even nouns that remain quite ambiguous about their antecedents in the sentence. Does the article have a foreign accent, i.e., is it clear that a native speaker of English did not write it? These are not merely technical issues of grammar to be somehow dealt with by a copy-editor down the line. Rather they involve the successful communication of a set of ideas to an audience; and this is the basis of scholarship today.
Final evaluation

Should this paper be:

(a) rejected for this journal?
(b) does it show sufficient promise for revision, in ways that you have clearly demonstrated in your review, to encourage the authors to invest significant time and energy in revision for this journal?

Your bottom-line advice to the editor is crucial. Make a decision; state it clearly in your remarks to the editor in the space provided.

Remember that not all of the articles submitted to a journal will be published.
Some reasons to reject a manuscript:
1. The issues have already been addressed in prior studies;
2. The data have been collected in such a way as to preclude useful investigation;
3. The manuscript is not ready for publication—it is incomplete, in the improper format, or error-ridden.

Most rejected articles do find a home in other journals. Don’t tease authors with hopes for publication in the Review if you feel it is not likely.
Bad Reviews

• A bad review is:
• superficial,
• nasty
• petty
• self-serving, or arrogant.
It indulges the reviewer’s biases with no justification.
It focuses exclusively on weaknesses and offers no specific suggestions for improvement.
Good Reviews

A good review is:
- supportive,
- constructive,
- thoughtful,
- fair.

It identifies both strengths and weaknesses, and offers concrete suggestions for improvements.

It acknowledges the reviewer’s biases where appropriate, and justifies the reviewer’s conclusions.
An example of reviewing a MS

• Reviewing PM-08-236-10
• Corresponding Author: ???????
• In the MS submitted to JICS entitled as "Analysis of binding interaction of bisdemethoxycurcumin and diacetylbisdemethoxycurcumin with bovine serum albumin" the authors have studied the interactions of bisdemethoxycurcumin (BDMC) and diacetylbisdemethoxycurcumin (DABC) with bovine serum albumin (BSA) using fluorescence and circular dichroism spectroscopy. They have calculated the number of substantive binding sites and the binding constants for this reaction. They showed that BDMC has higher affinity to BSA than DABC. Also they claimed that the secondary structure of BSA was changed by BDMC and DABC.
• I agree with the authors that the interaction of Anti-cancer drugs and substances with the human proteins is an important subject of science, but this study seems to be immature and needs some works to show the binding sites of BDMC and DABC to the protein. The following questions should be clarified before publication:
  • 1) In Page 3 line 15-19, the authors tried to convince the readers that BSA is similar to HAS. In this case why have the authors not studied the interaction of Curcuminoids with HSA itself?
  • 2) In Page 8, line 3, the S parameter has not been identified, It is may be the surface under fluorescence peak.
  • 3) Why did the authors study the far-UV circular dichroism spectra of BSA up 0.75 to L/P? by my opinion this study should be continued to upper molar ratio.
  • 4) The discussion on the difference between CD spectra of BDMC and DABC is so weak. Just expressing the different configuration of protein due to ligand binding is not enough.
  • 5) For the DABC the n value is 0.46, what does it mean?
  • 6) Some editing corrections should be done on MS.
Dear Dr. Amani,

On 27 Jan 2017, you kindly agreed to review the above manuscript for Journal of Experimental & Clinical Cancer Research.

According to our records you are almost reaching the deadline now, which is 10 Feb 2017.

You can access the manuscript and submit your comments online at:

http://JECC.edmgr.com/

Your username is: AMani-699
Your password is: available at this link http://JECC.edmgr.com/Default.aspx?pg=accountFinder.aspx&firstname=Mojtaba&lastname=Amani&email_address=mojtaba_amani@gmail.com

Alternatively, please submit your review recommendation directly at:
http://jecc.edmgr.com/l.asp?id=34425&l=JH1XBQD1

We look forward to receiving your review.

Best wishes,
Review Question

*Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

- Please select a response
- An exceptional article
**Review Questions**

*Level of interest*
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

- Please select a response
- An exceptional article
- An article of importance in its field
- An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
- An article of limited interest

*Quality of written English*
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

- Please select a response
- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
- Needs some language corrections before being published
**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

- Please select a response
- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
- Needs some language corrections before being published
- Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below. (Limit 300 Characters)
*Declaration of competing interests*

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below. (Limit 300 Characters)

I declare that I have no competing interests.
Dear Editor-in-chief,

In the MS# JECC-D-17-00047 entitled "ZNF143 promotes the proliferation and suppresses the apoptosis via ROS/p53 axis in gastric cancer", authors have studied the effects of over-expression and suppression of ZNF143 in GC derived cell lines. They showed that the suppression of ZNF143 could decrease the viability, proliferation while over-expression of ZNF143 has diverse effects. They claimed that ZNF143 induces its effects via ROS mediated Apoptosis.

Albeit well study design and ration behind it, I think the current version of MS needs some corrections before getting acceptance for publication. Followings are some points which authors should clarify to improve the quality of MS.
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Dear Dr. Amani,

Thank you very much for your review of manuscript JECC-D-17-00047, 'ZNF143 promotes the proliferation and suppresses the apoptosis via ROS/p53 axis in gastric cancer'.

We greatly appreciate your assistance.

Best wishes,

Mauro Castelli

Click here to Reply or Forward
Thank you for your participation