

Be familiar with the Guide for Authors available at JAMDA.com

When writing a review, begin with strengths of the paper, followed by a constructive, respectful critique of the following areas. (In structuring your review, authors will benefit if you refer to the line numbers in their paper when providing your comments.)

First impressions

- Substance:** Is the research novel and important to post-acute and long-term care, and does it add to the literature? If not, it may not be necessary to provide a detailed review.
- Format:** Has the appropriate structure (e.g., type of paper, word count, headings) and language (e.g., resident/patient) been used?

Abstract – *you will want to re-review the abstract after you read the entire paper*

- Substance:** Does the abstract summarize the paper, include key findings, and note conclusions and implications?
- Format:** Does the abstract include the proper headings, and is it an appropriate length?

Introduction

- Substance:** Does the introduction make clear the purpose and importance of the paper, and put into perspective the material that follows in the rest of the paper? Does it situate the topic in the context of existing literature and current conceptualization, and make clear the important gap that the paper will fill? Are the research questions clearly stated?
- Format:** Is the introduction well organized?

Methods

- Substance:** Are the methods appropriate and clear enough so that the study could be replicated? If details are cited elsewhere, does the paper include enough information so that it is sufficiently clear? Are the variables under study clear, and is their measurement sound? Are the analyses understandable to a non-expert reader? Are additional analyses indicated, such as to include confounders? Is the study sufficiently powered in terms of sample size? Are missing data addressed?
 - If an RCT/intervention, is randomization clear and appropriate? Is blinding in place? Is the control situation clear? Are CONSORT guidelines reported? Is fidelity/adherence addressed?
- Format:** Is the flow logical from eligibility → recruitment/inclusion → consent/participation → data collection → analyses? Are subheadings appropriate?

Results

- Substance:** Are the results presented in an objective (non-editorialized) manner? Is the participation/inclusion rate noted (which could relate to bias)? Do the analyses answer the research question? If the paper speaks to an “effect,” are the methods rigorous enough to make that claim? Do the results map to the information in the tables and figures? Are the results addressed in terms of statistical and clinical significance? Are they reported with proper precision, in terms of the number of decimal places?
- Format:** Are the results organized in relation to the research questions? Are tables and figures used when appropriate?

Discussion

- Substance:** Is the discussion consistent with the results (as is appropriate) or does it extend beyond the results (which is not appropriate)? Is the logic sound, and is the discussion put in the context of existing literature? Are alternative explanations explored? Are limitations noted in terms of validity, generalizability, and other matters?
- Format:** Does discussion of key findings precede that of secondary (and non-significant) findings?

Conclusions and implications – especially for practice and/or policy

- Substance:** Do the conclusions/implications appropriately build off of the results, and provide the implications of study findings for practice and/or policy, and research (if applicable)? Are they justifiable based on the results?
- Format:** Are practice, policy, and research implications (if applicable) presented in a logical manner?

Tables and figures

- Substance:** Do the tables and figures convey important information about the sample and results? Do they relate to the analyses?
- Format:** Are the data displayed in an easy-to-understand manner? Are the title, legends, row and column headings (tables), axis labels (figures), and footnotes, clear enough so that the table/figure stands alone, and the sample size is clear? Are the variables presented consistently across the tables/figures? Is some material best presented as a supplement (i.e., appendix/on-line)?

References

- Substance:** Are the references current and sufficient, and do they include work published in *JAMDA* and other seminal articles? Are they accurate in terms of what other authors have reported?
- Format:** Are the references as cited in the text and at the end of the paper in accordance with *JAMDA* guidelines?

Other/general comments

- Would general comments be helpful, such as attention to grammar, punctuation, abbreviations, and consistent formatting?
- Does the title accurately reflect the content of the manuscript and is it engaging to a reader?