

## **MEDICC Review Peer Review Feedback Form**

Manuscript T	Citle
Peer Review	er
1. The centra	l issue the paper addresses is: Clearly and immediately identified Not described in terms of its origin, scale or importance Not identified
2. The specif	ic purpose of the research is:  Clearly and immediately defined Imprecisely defined Not distinguished from the central issue Other, please explain:
3. The literat	ure review/background:  Examines the most important and recently published work on the topi Is not current or sufficient Other, please explain:
4. The object	ives and hypothesis of the work are: Clear, precise, measurable and feasible Too general, vague or ambiguous Other, please explain:
5. The study	design is: Appropriate for the declared objective Inadequate Not sufficiently described Other, please explain:

6. The	method	Is and techniques are: Appropriate and applicable Not appropriate or applicable Other, please explain:
7. The	materia	Ils and methods data is: Sufficient to replicate the study Insufficient Other, please explain:
8. The	statistic	cal methods are:  Appropriate for the type of variables used and answers the proposed hypothesis Inadequate Not described in sufficient detail Not described Other, please explain:
9. The	results:	Are germane to the study's objectives Are not germane Include sufficient details to justify the conclusions Are insufficient Other, please explain:
10. The	e tables	and figures: Are acceptable <b>and</b> appropriate Do not present and interpret the data with sufficient clarity Are redundant (repeat rather than complement information in the text) Graphic, table or figure number can be eliminated Graphic +/o table +/o figure number and can be combined It's advisable to add a graphic/table to illustrate

11. The	discussion:
	Interprets the results correctly in terms of significance and limitations
	Does not interpret the results
	Suffers from important omissions
	<u> </u>
	Contains too many generalizations
	Repeats the results
	Other, please explain:
12. The	conclusion:
	Supports the findings
	Is unjustified because it is not supported by the results
	Other, please explain:
	Unici, picase explain.
	<del></del>
12 771.	1.11.11
13. The	bibliography:
	Is sufficient and appropriate
	Is insufficient
	Is not current
	Does not mention key references such as:
14. The	information in the manuscript:
	Is new and makes a valuable contribution to the field
	Repeats already published or known results
	Includes irrelevant material
4 7 777	
15. The	
	Is concise and informative
	Should be modified; for instance:
16. The	abstract:
	Clearly summarizes objectives, the research context and study design,
	methods, key results and major conclusions.
	Is incomplete and should be rewritten to include:

17. The structure is:				
		Appropriate		
	Ц	Inappropriate and should be changed		
	Ш	Other, please explain:		
10 Th	o atrilo	ia		
18. Th	e style	Appropriate, clear, concise and logical		
	H	Simplistic, unclear +/o deficient		
	Ħ	Redundant and should be condensed		
	Ħ	Excessively wordy		
		Other, please explain:		
	_	•		
10 101				
19. Th	e manu	recript is:		
	H	Excellent, recommended without reservations Good, generally meets MR criteria and deserves serious consideration		
	H	Fair, has major flaws but topic deserves consideration		
	H	Bad, poorly written, inappropriate		
		Bad, poorty written, mappropriate		
20. <b>RE</b>	COM	MENDATION - The manuscript:		
		Should be considered for publication		
		Should be rejected for the following main reasons:		
		The outbor should consider publishing in a different journal such as:		
		The author should consider publishing in a different journal, such as:		
		Should be published with minor revisions. Please explain in detail:		
		Should be published with major revisions. Please explain in detail:		

21. OTHER COMMENTS:	
Пт	dealars that I do not have any
real or potential conflict of interest that could	, declare that I do not have any l bias my review of this manuscript.