

How to Review a Medical Education Journal Paper?

Before accepting or declining an invitation to review a paper, below are a few factors to consider

1. Does the paper match your area of expertise?
2. Do you have a potential conflict of interest? Please disclose this to the editor.
3. Do you have the time to commit, make sure you can meet the deadline?

<p>Step 1: Skim-read the manuscript</p>	<p><u>Scope:</u> Is the manuscript related to medical and health professional education? Out-of-scope? Originality? Spot potential major flaws?</p> <p><u>Quality:</u> The clarity of the language and content. Methodological rigour that covers clear research question, appropriate and adequate methodology, presentation of results and conclusion</p>
<p>Step 2: Read the manuscript again, focus on evaluating section by section</p> <p><i>Take notes and comments when possible.</i></p>	<p><u>Title:</u> Does the title encapsulate the key message?</p> <p><u>Abstract:</u> Does the abstract summarise adequately and clearly the purpose, methods and outcomes of the manuscript?</p> <p><u>Introduction:</u> Does the paper establish a clear conceptual framework? Is the purpose of the study made clear by the inclusion of a research question or hypotheses?</p> <p><u>Methods:</u> Has the development and design of the data collection methods (whether quantitative or qualitative) been outlined clearly? Are the methods appropriate for the question? Is the data analysis appropriate given the problem and the data available?</p> <p><u>Results:</u> Are the results clearly presented? Are they consistent with both the methods used and the problem the authors are trying to address? Do they yield a clear answer to the research question?</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Are the findings supported by the results? What research questions have been addressed and what further questions</p>

	<p>have been identified? Are recommendations for change in practice supported by the analysis? Are limitations adequately presented and discussed? Are the study questions/theme and the results useful to the readership in Asia-Pacific region even though similar studies are found in other contexts?</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Are the conclusions clearly stated? To include clear regional relevance and potential impact in the paper.</p> <p><u>References:</u> Are the references current, comprehensive and accurate? Any key references missing?</p>
Step 3: Writing the review	Reviews should be polite, constructive and helpful. For each section, indicate the things that have done well and things that could be done to make this a better manuscript if revised. Avoid including personal details including your name as it is a double-blind peer review.
Step 4. Provide the Rating	An overall rating that takes everything into account, including relevance, interest and practicality, and also methodological issues.
Step 5: Your Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reject – Give constructive feedback explaining your reasoning and describing ways to improve the research 2. Accept 3. Revise – Either major or minor (explain the revision required and indicate to the editor whether you are willing to review the revision).
Step 6: Comments to Editors	To provide confidential comments to editors, best reserved for communicating malpractice such as suspected plagiarism, fraud, unethical procedures, duplicate publication.

References

1. Hays R, Jennings B, Gibbs T, 2019, 'How to review a paper on medical education', MedEdPublish, 8, [3], 9, <https://doi.org/10.15694/mep.2019.000158.1>
2. Medical Education - Guidelines for Reviewers. Wiley Online Library. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/page/journal/13652923/homepage/guidelines_for_reviewers.htm