

ULTRASONOGRAPHY

Manuscript Reviewer Guidelines

~~~~~

### I. Reviewer Template

We recommend reviewers to use this template to help focus their reviews. In the template below up to 3 comments are given for each subtitle, but, it can be changed at the reviewer's discretion. Please do not include multiple comments in a single paragraph. Items to be checked for each subsection are described to refer.

MS number and title \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Summary (one or two short paragraphs)

Strengths (up to 3 points)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Weaknesses (up to 3 points)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Specific comments

Title

- 1.

Abstract

- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

*Essential information in each section?*

*Purpose clearly stated and same as at the end of introduction?*

*Clearly prospective or retrospective?*

*Same data/information as in text?*

*Specific data in results section?*

*Conclusion warranted from data and same as at the end of discussion?*

#### Introduction

- 5.
- 6.
- 7.

*Logical case for why study was undertaken?*

*Appropriate references avoiding excessive review of literature?*

*Clear hypothesis and purpose of study at the end of introduction?*

*Purpose same as at that of the introduction?*

#### Materials and Methods

- 8.
- 9.
- 10.

*Human Study - IRB approval stated in 1st paragraph?*

*Animal Studies - Approval of Institutional animal care committee in 1st paragraph?*

*When study was done? (begin date/end date)*

*Patient group fully defined? (age, sex, inclusion & exclusion criteria, consecutive or random selection, drop out)*

*Logical presentation of total participants and logical division into groups with rationale for division? (consider flow chart)*

*Clear description of techniques and procedures performed?*

*Number, training, and expertise of persons executing and reading the index tests?*

*Were readers appropriately blinded?*

*Reference standard procedures clearly identified?*

*Indicate specifically what was evaluated & how evaluations were performed?*

*Statistical methods clearly defined?*

*Included all items evaluated for which they present results in the Results section?*

*No misplaced information belonging to another section?*

## Results

11.

12.

13.

*Consistency between M&M and results, presenting results for all items evaluated in M&M?*

*Results presented in logical sequence?*

*Results for statistical evaluations and significance?*

*Numerators & denominators provided for proportional data such as prevalence, incidence, success/complication rates, sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, etc in text and tables?*

*If tables & figs are used appropriately without redundancy?*

*No misplaced information belonging in another section?*

## Discussion

14.

15.

16.

*Avoided repetition of results?*

*Avoided repetition of information already in introduction?*

*Avoided presentation of extensive review of topic?*

*Presented comparison of study results with those from previous relevant studies?*

*Discussion focused and gave important findings in context of existing knowledge?*

*Discussion of limitations and future work to be performed?*

*Conclusions directly linked to the purpose and supported by data?*

*For animal/non-human experimental studies, comments on potential future practical applications included?*

*No misplaced information belonging in another section?*

## References

17.

18.

19.

*Listed in order of citation in text?*

*Format adhering to guidelines?*

*Updated, succinct, and not omitting important references?*

*Included citable ULTRASONOGRAPHY articles?*

*No misquotes or incorrect citations?*

Tables

20.

21.

*Truly needed and not a mere repetition of text?*

*Abbreviations explained?*

*Numerators and denominators provided?*

*Title provided for each table?*

*Numbers in tables matched those in text?*

Figures

22.

23.

*Conformed to the quality guidelines?*

*Appropriate number of illustrations?*

*Figure legends clearly state important features with present tense?*

*Used appropriate labels and all labels on illustrations mentioned in caption?*

*Type of image, contrast used/non-contrast, plane given?*

*Stain and original magnification given of histology slides?*

*Absence of any identifiers of the authors or the patient?*

.....

**II. Do's and Don'ts**

1. Check the review language in your original reviewer invitation e-mail.
2. Notify editorial office any potential duplicated or fabricated work.
3. Inform office of any biases or conflicts of interest.
4. Inform office of a colleague better suited for review.
5. Do not share contents of manuscript with anyone.
6. Destroy any printed copies of manuscript.
7. Do not identify yourself in comments to authors.
8. Do not contact authors.
9. Do not use derogatory statements and read review as if you are the author receiving.
10. Do not focus on grammatical and spelling errors.
11. Do not speculate in your comments.
12. Do not encourage authors to provide extraneous information.
13. Do not directly indicate acceptance and rejection in the comments to the authors.
14. Comments for the editor only should be placed in the section for the editor.

Thank you for reviewing for the *ULTRASONOGRAPHY*.