

Reviewer Guidance - Evaluation checklist for Medical journals

Study Design and Statistical Criteria		Present and sufficient or N/A?
Sample size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The exact sample size (n) for each group/condition (as a number, not a range). Including information about sex ratio, age distribution, ethnicity, if relevant. b) Is there an explanation for how the sample was obtained? c) Is there a pre-defined analysis that determined the choice of sample size? or was it a convenience sample? 	
Recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is there a description of recruitment, including study location(s), inclusion and exclusion criteria, that enables the reader to understand whether the participants are representative and suitable for the research question? 	
Randomization and blinding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is it described how participants were allocated to groups (if applicable) and a statement on whether the patients and investigators were blinded to group assignment and whether blinded outcome assessment was performed? 	
Study progression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is information included on the number of participants at each stage of the study from recruitment to analysis and dropouts/exclusions explained? b) Do the authors need to account for missing data in their analysis? 	
Statistical methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Information on the statistical methods and measures used. It should be clear whether the tests are one-sided or two-sided, whether there are adjustments for multiple comparisons, whether medians or means are being shown, whether error bars are standard deviations (SD), standard error of mean (SEM) or confidence intervals. b) Are the choices of covariates and cut-offs explained? 	
Analytical methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Have the appropriate statistical tests been used to assess significance? Do the data meet the assumptions of the tests? b) Is there an estimate of variation within each group of data, and is the variance similar between groups that are being statistically compared? 	

Reporting	a) Does the reporting of statistical results adhere to community standards? For more information see https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/sampl/	
Transparency	a) Is it clear what analysis was used for each result and were they suitable?	
Reproducibility		
Data availability	a) Have the authors provided reasonable access to the data required for review, and described how they will make their data available at publication? If it is not, does the author's rationale for not making the data available seem reasonable? b) Have the authors complied with community-established norms of data deposition (for a list of mandated data deposition and appropriate repositories please follow the table here)?	
Reproducibility	a) Does the description of the methodology give potential for reproducibility of the work?	

For further information on a specific journal, please refer to the journal's website or contact the journal's Editorial Office.

Detailed checklists are available for a number of study designs, including:

- Randomized controlled trials ([CONSORT](#)) and protocols ([SPIRIT](#))
- Systematic reviews and meta-analyses* ([PRISMA](#)) and protocols ([PRISMA-P](#))
- Observational studies ([STROBE](#))
- Case reports ([CARE](#))
- Qualitative research ([COREQ](#))
- Diagnostic/prognostic studies ([STARD](#) and [TRIPOD](#))

- Economic evaluations ([CHEERS](#))
- Pre-clinical animal studies ([ARRIVE](#))
- [SAMPL guidelines](#)