Radiology Manuscript Reviewer Checklist

Some journals provide a detailed list of reviewer criteria, such as this list: https://pubs.rsna.org/page/radiology/reviewer-checklist  Peer-reviewers read and assess each manuscript for many issues. Reviewers use a template for writing their reviews. Consider the comments from each peer reviewer as a free 3 to 6 hour consultation with a subject matter expert.

The checklist below is extracted from our editorial “2016: Reviewing for Radiology—Reporting Guidelines and Why We Use Them” (Radiology 2016;doi:10.1148/radiol.2016161204). We invite reviewers to use this guide to help focus their reviews.

**MS Number: __-_______**

Return your review on time or EARLY □ Yes □ No

Do you have a conflict of interest? □ Yes □ No

**Summary** - One-paragraph summary complete? (What was done and found)? □ Yes □ No

*For the following, please number your comments consecutively, giving page and line numbers where appropriate. Individual comments should be listed as separate line items*

**Major Strengths** listed? □ Yes □ No

**Major Weaknesses** listed? □ Yes □ No

**Advances in Knowledge** evaluated? □ Yes □ No

□ agree □ disagree

**Implications for Patient Care** evaluated? □ Yes □ No

□ agree □ disagree

**If the manuscript had a checklist, were all pertinent items addressed?** □ Yes □ No

**Specific Comments**

Suggestions for improvement? □ Yes □ No

Concerns or disagreements and reason why? □ Yes □ No

Items essential but missing from manuscript? □ Yes □ No

Comments overall: ____________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

**Abstract**

Appropriate length (typically < 250 words)? □ Yes □ No

Essential Information in each section? □ Yes □ No

Purpose clearly stated? □ Yes □ No

Purpose same as at the end of introduction? □ Yes □ No
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly prospective or retrospective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same information as in text?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients, age, sex stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various groups; including controls described?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures performed described?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifics of evaluation; statistical analyses complete?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific data in Results section?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of statistical evaluations performed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion warranted from data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on abstract:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate length (typically &lt; 400 words)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal review of literature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical case for why study was undertaken?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate references?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Hypothesis and purpose of study at end of introduction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misplaced information belonging in different section?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on introduction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials and Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate length (typically &lt; 800 words)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If appropriate, disclosure information provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Study - IRB approval stated in 1st paragraph. Informed consent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Studies - Approval of Institutional animal care committee in 1st paragraph?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When study was done (begin date/end date)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient group fully defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(age, sex, inclusion &amp; exclusion criteria, consecutive or random selection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control patients or volunteers well defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If healthy volunteers are controls, evidence for “healthy” stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical presentation of total participants? (consider flow chart)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical division into groups with rationale for division?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear description of procedures performed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number, training, and expertise of persons executing and reading the index tests?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were readers appropriately blinded?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate specifically what was evaluated &amp; how evaluations were performed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical methods clearly defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If appropriate, succinct description of theoretical consideration or proposed models?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Included all items evaluated for which they present results in the Results section? □ Yes □ No
Subtitles used and appropriate? □ Yes □ No
Misplaced information belonging to another section? □ Yes □ No
Comments on M&M:

Results
Appropriate length (typically < 1000 words)? □ Yes □ No
Presented results for all items evaluated in M&M? □ Yes □ No
Results presented in logical sequence? □ Yes □ No
Subtitles used in concert with M&M □ Yes □ No
Results for statistical evaluations and significance? □ Yes □ No
Numerators & denominators provided for percentages, sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, PPV, NPV in text or tables? □ Yes □ No
Misplaced information belonging in another section? □ Yes □ No
Consistency between Materials & Methods and Results? □ Yes □ No
Comments on results:_______________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Discussion
Appropriate length (typically < 1000 words)? □ Yes □ No
Stated pertinent new findings and conclusions? □ Yes □ No
Conclusions supported by data? □ Yes □ No
Avoided repetition of results? □ Yes □ No
Avoided repetition of information already in introduction? □ Yes □ No
Avoided presentation of extensive review of topic? □ Yes □ No
Presented results and conclusions to other relevant studies? □ Yes □ No
Discussion focused and give important findings in context of existing knowledge □ Yes □ No
Discussion of limitations and future work to be performed? □ Yes □ No
Linked conclusions with purpose? □ Yes □ No
If new hypotheses or speculation; warranted and clearly identified? □ Yes □ No
Recommendations appropriate and based on study? □ Yes □ No
Misplaced information belonging in another section? □ Yes □ No
Comments on discussion:___________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Appendix
Should some material in text be placed in appendix? □ Yes □ No
Comments on appendix:___________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
**References**

- Listed in order of citation in text? □ Yes □ No
- Adhere to guidelines? □ Yes □ No
- Excessive or outdated? □ Yes □ No
- Important references omitted? □ Yes □ No
- Misquoted or incorrectly cited □ Yes □ No
- Comments on references: ________________________________________________________________

---

**Tables**

- Needed to display data and simplify text? □ Yes □ No
- Repeat text? □ Yes □ No
- Abbreviations explained? □ Yes □ No
- Numerators and denominators provided? □ Yes □ No
- Title provided for each table? □ Yes □ No
- Numbers in tables correspond to those in text? □ Yes □ No
- Some on-line only? □ Yes □ No
- Comments on tables: _____________________________________________________________

---

**Figures**

- Are figures of high quality? □ Yes □ No
- Captions clearly state important features? □ Yes □ No
- All labels on illustrations mentioned in caption? □ Yes □ No
- Features mentioned in caption labeled on illustration? □ Yes □ No
- Type of image, contrast used/non-contrast, plane given? □ Yes □ No
- MRI images include pulse sequence information (only needed if not given or different from that in M&M)? □ Yes □ No
- Stain and original magnification given of histology slides? □ Yes □ No
- Too many/redundant illustrations? □ Yes □ No
- Some figures on-line only? □ Yes □ No
- Comments on figures: ________________________________________________________________

---