

# Content review form

---

## SUBMISSION

**Title**

**First author**

**Department**

**Institution**

Academic Medical Center

VU University Medical Center

Other

**Paper**

Original Research

Case Report

(Systematic) Review

Other

---

## REVIEWERS

**Staff member**

**Student member**

**Feedback**

E-mail

Verbal

---

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Please follow these general instructions while reviewing this paper

- 1 Be critical
- 2 Justify all criticism by specific references to the text of the paper or to published literature
- 3 Be specific: refer to line numbers in the paper or to exact regions where you wish changes to occur
- 4 Give a clear recommendation

**1 ABSTRACT**

Read the following statements and check the box that best reflects your rating of the statement.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	N/A
The statement of the authors makes logical sense					
The abstract is written in a comprehensible way					
The abstract is understandable for readers who are not experts on the investigated matter					
The abstract reflects the content of the paper					

**If any statement scores 'Poor' or 'Fair', please elaborate:**

**2 FORMAT**

Read the following statements and check the box that best reflects your rating of the statement.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	N/A
The included tables and figures contribute to the quality of the paper					
The included tables and figures are comprehensible					

**If any statement scores 'Poor' or 'Fair', please elaborate:**

**3 TITLE, AUTHORS & KEYWORDS**

**Authors**                      The names of all authors (first name, middle initial and last name) are included

**Institutions**                It is clear for all authors, which author is associated with which institution

*If not, the reviewed paper can not be accepted*

Read the following statements and check the box that best reflects your rating of the statement.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	N/A
The title clearly describes the content of the paper					
The included keywords fit the content of the paper					

**If any statement scores 'Poor' or 'Fair', please elaborate:**

**4 INTRODUCTION**

Read the following statements and check the box that best reflects your rating of the statement.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	N/A
The introduction provides the necessary background for the reader to understand the thinking process of the investigator					
The introduction clarifies why the investigators initiated this study					
The introduction clarifies why it is important the subject is being investigated in this study					
The introduction describes the primary objective(s) of this study					
The introduction clearly describes the hypothesis(hypotheses)					

**If any statement scores 'Poor' or 'Fair', please elaborate:**

**5 METHOD**

Read the following statements and check the box that best reflects your rating of the statement.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	N/A
It is clear how the data was collected					
It is clear which patients were included and excluded, and which criteria were used for in- and exclusion					
A sample size and/or power estimation is clearly described					
It is mentioned according to which Helsinki declaration this study was performed					
The study design is suitable for answering the questions posed					
It is clear what type of data was recorded					
The information provided is sufficient for replicating the study					

**If any statement scores 'Poor' or 'Fair', please elaborate:**

**6 RESULTS / STATISTICS**

**Interpretation of results**

This section includes no interpretation of presented results

*If not, the reviewed paper can not be accepted.*

Read the following statements and check the box that best reflects your rating of the statement.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	N/A
The results are clear and logical					
The statistical analyses are used appropriately for the accompanying data					
The statistical program used to perform the analyses is clearly stated					

**If any statement scores 'Poor' or 'Fair', please elaborate:**

---

## 7 CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION

**New information** This section includes no new information or results, not previously introduced in the paper

*If not, the reviewed paper can not be accepted.*

Read the following statements and check the box that best reflects your rating of the statement.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	N/A
The presented conclusions are supported by the results					
The clinical significance of the reported differences in statistical analysis is reported					
It is clear how the results relate to expectations and earlier research					
It is clear whether this study supports or contradicts previous theories					
It is clear how this study impacts scientific knowledge on the matter					

**If any statement scores 'Poor' or 'Fair', please elaborate:**



## 8 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Use of language, grammatical errors, use of transitional verbs, originality of research, importance of the subject investigated, etc.

---

## RECOMMENDATION TO THE EDITOR

<b>The reviewer recommends</b>	Acceptance of this paper without revision
	Revision of this paper
	Rejection of this paper

**Please elaborate:**

**Date of review**

Please save the completed form using the following document name: "AMSj\_Review\_[First Author]\_[Date dd/mm/yyyy]".pdf  
**Please send this file to the Editors in Chief.**

*If the program is unable to save changes, please export this document using File > Print > Save as PDF.*