

PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK "PERSPECTIVE" MANUSCRIPT SUBMITTED TO MEDICC REVIEW

Author Guideline

Perspective provides insightful, well-referenced discussion of current topics in health care, medicine, population health, ethics, international health cooperation, training of health professionals, or health policies and practice, including their implications for health equity, quality of health care or social wellbeing in general. Editors prefer articles using concrete experience as a reference point for discussion. The text is limited to 2500 words (3000 in Spanish), plus 2 figures/tables/images and no more than 20 references. All submissions to this section are subject to double-blind peer review.

Title:

Peer Reviewer/ Country:

1. Organization and Content INTRODUCTION			
Problem/condition is well defined	□Yes	□No	N/A*
Context or background defined	Yes	No	∏ N/A
Thesis of essay clearly stated	Yes	□No	□ N/A
Relevant literature is mentioned	Yes	☐ No	N/A
BODY OF ESSAY			
Key concepts and terms are clearly defined	Yes	☐ No	N/A
Builds a logical case for argument presented	Yes	☐ No	N/A
Provides clear evidence base	Yes	☐ No	N/A
DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION			
Expresses clearly the author's point of view	Yes	☐ No	N/A
Responds to the thesis of essay	Yes	☐ No	N/A
References to literature and context are appropriate	Yes	☐ No	N/A
Concise review of main points	Yes Yes	☐ No	N/A
Describes implications of essay	Yes	☐ No	N/A
* N/A: Not Applicable			
2. Title is concise and appropriate	Yes	□ No	
Suggested alternative title:			
Responds to the thesis of essay References to literature and context are appropriate Concise review of main points Describes implications of essay * N/A: Not Applicable 2. Title is concise and appropriate	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No	

3. Sty	le and tone are: Appropriate, clear, concise and logical Simplistic, unclear +/o deficient Redundant and should be condensed Excessively wordy Other, please explain:			
4. Gra	phics, tables and figures:			
	Are acceptable and appropriate Are clear and consistent with the text Should better present and interpret the data for clarity Are redundant or there are too many	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	No No No No	N/AN/AN/AN/A
	A graphic/table should be added to illustrate			
	Other, please explain:			
5. The	bibliography: Is sufficient and appropriate Is insufficient Is not current Does not mention key references such as:	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No	
6. The	manuscript is: Excellent, recommended without reservations Good, generally meets MR criteria and deserves se Fair, has major flaws but topic deserves considerate Bad, poorly written, inappropriate		ideration	
12. RI	COMMENDATION - The manuscript: Should be considered for publication Should be rejected for the following main reasons:			
	The author should consider publishing in a different	nt journal,	such as: _	

	Should be published with minor revisions. Please explain in detail:
_	
_	Should be published with major revisions. Please explain in detail:
_	
_	
13. OTF	HER COMMENTS:
☐ I,	, declare that I do not have any real or conflict of interest that could bias my review of this manuscript.
potential	conflict of interest that could bias my review of this manuscript.