Scientific review form of original articles

STROBE Statement

# Title:

No:

Date:

Type of article:

🞎 Review article

🞎Original article

🞎Short communication

🞎Case report

🞎 National Report

🞎Letter to Editor

Referee name:

Reviewer Checklist for the Editor/Author

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Requested Questions |  | Yes | No | Comments |
| 1 | Is this article … | An original work? |  |  |  |
| A new subject? |  |  |
| 2 | Is the title … | Suitable for its content?  Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title? |  |  |  |
| Is limited to 10 to 15 ubstantive words? |  |  |
| 3 | Is a short title … | Suitable for its content? |  |  |  |
| 4 | Are the authors affiliations… | written in the correct order according to the guideline? |  |  |  |
| 5 | Are the keywords… | written in mesh?  Are the keywords 3 to 10? |  |  |  |
| 6 | Is the abstract … | an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found؟ |  |  |  |
| 7 | Is the introduction … | Background/rationale:Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported؟  Objectives: State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses? |  |  |  |
| Literature Review: Has literature review? |  |  |  |
| Gap: Has the research and innovation gap been fully explained? |  |  |  |
| General purpose: The general purpose of the research stated at the end of the introduction? |  |  |  |
| 10 | Does the discussion …? | Key results: Summarise key results with reference to study objectives? |  |  |  |
| Summary of the results of other researchers who disagree with the results of the research. Then the researcher must argue about these discrepancies?  Summarize the results of other researchers that are in line with the research results? |  |  |  |
| Interpretation :overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence |  |  |  |
| Generalizability: Discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results? |
| Limitations: Discuss limitations of the study؟  Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision?  Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias |  |  |  |
| 11 | Are the references …? | The Vancouver style? |  |  |  |
| Up to date? |  |  |  |
| Adequate in number? |  |  |  |
| 12 | Would you suggest …? | Reduction in any part of the manuscript? |  |  |  |
| Addition in any part of the manuscript? |  |  |  |
| 13 | Is the quality of scientific language…? | Satisfactory? |  |  |  |
| 14 | Is the acknowledgement…? | Include? |  |  |  |

Additional comments

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Which of the following do you suggest about the publication of this article in the university scientific journal?

🞎Accept in present form

🞎Accept with minor changes

🞎Accept with major changes

🞎Reject
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