



# Structured peer review prompts for original research article type

Manuscript section	Prompt
Abstract	Assess whether the abstract accurately reflects all essential aspects of the study, including all major results and limitations.
Introduction	<p>The background and literature section should be up-to-date and appropriate for the topic. The introduction should clearly explain the scientific background and rationale of the study.</p> <p>Review whether the (primary and secondary) objectives are clearly stated at the end of the introduction.</p>
Methods	<p>The study methods, which include the theory, applicability, and modeling, should be described in sufficient detail to enable replication and reproducibility. If applicable, check whether the experimental design (e.g. RCT, case-control, cohort, or cross-sectional) is identified. The patient population should be described, including a detailed sample size estimation. There should also be a literature-backed explanation for the minimal clinically important difference (MCID).</p> <p>Statistical analyses such as controls, sampling mechanisms, and statistical reporting (e.g. p-values, CIs, effect sizes, etc.) should be appropriately described.</p>
Results	<p>Verify whether the presentation of the results, including the number of tables and figures, are appropriate to best visualize the findings of the study.</p> <p>If the study contains statistical analyses, examine whether additional sub-analyses or statistical measures are needed such as reporting of CIs, effect sizes, and/or sensitivity analyses.</p>



ELSEVIER

### Manuscript section

### Prompt

Discussion

The interpretation of the results and study conclusions should be supported by the data and study design.

Assess whether the authors have clearly emphasized the limitations of their study, including the theory, methods, and argument.

References

Scrutinize whether the references used in this study are the most up-to-date and relevant for the topic at hand.

Overall

Overall, state if this paper presents research that is novel or important [in some other aspect e.g exhibits reproducibility] for the journal or for the field. Note if the research contributes to the educational goals of the journal.

While all papers undergo integrity checks, please assess and comment if the authors need to address any ethical/integrity concerns.

## Optional prompt for original research article type

### Manuscript section

### Prompt

Title

Evaluate whether the title accurately and sufficiently describes the content and may want to factor in discoverability/searchability of the title. Note that for certain research types (e.g., randomized controlled trials), the study type should be indicated in the title.



# Structured peer review prompts for review article type

## Manuscript section

## Prompt

Overall relevance

Evaluate whether the authors clearly explain the rationale for writing a review article in this field. Provide specific suggestions on how the authors could better justify the need and relevance of this review.

Historical development and insights

Assess whether the review provides a comprehensive overview of the historical development of the field while also offering insights into its future directions. Identify important historical developments or potential future trends that should be added or emphasized more strongly.

References

Evaluate whether the authors adequately discuss the most relevant and recent advances in the field, including coverage of all or most relevant research groups. Provide recommendations for improving the reference list, including suggestions for key topics, foundational studies, or recent publications that should be incorporated.

Methods and reproducibility

Assess whether the review is reported with sufficient methodological detail to allow replicability or reproducibility (e.g., clear search strategies, inclusion/exclusion criteria, risk-of-bias assessments, and summary methods). Provide specific suggestions on how the authors could improve the transparency and reproducibility of their review process.

Statistical analyses

Evaluate whether any statistical methods used (e.g., meta-analysis, meta-regression) are appropriate and clearly described, including reporting of relevant metrics such as p-values and 95% confidence intervals. Indicate clearly whether the review would benefit from additional peer review by a statistician, and provide suggestions for improving the statistical analyses, controls, sampling approach, or reporting.



ELSEVIER

**Manuscript section**

Essential reporting requirements

**Prompt**

Assess the overall structure, flow, and clarity of the manuscript. Suggest improvements such as adding or reorganizing subheadings, shortening or clarifying text, moving content between sections, or aligning the manuscript more closely with reporting standards (e.g., PRISMA guidelines).

Language quality

Evaluate whether the manuscript would benefit from professional language editing or improvements in grammar, clarity, or readability. Provide brief suggestions where appropriate.