

Review report on [Title of the article]

NB: If there is any conflict of interest, always state this in your email to the editors. Conflicts of interest occur when you know the authors' names and they are friends or colleagues of yours, or opposite.

General opinion and decision

Here you state your general opinion about the article. Subjects you can address include:

- Is the overall experimental approach (including subjects, study design, key methods, and data analysis) valid?
- Does the paper add anything relevant or new to the current knowledge of the subject?
- Is the subject interesting for the readers of RAMS?
- Can (bio)medical students understand the information and is it readable for them?
- Is the paper organised logically?
- Is all information needed, or can the article be shortened?
- Is there any missing information that should be added?

Lastly, also mention your final decision (accept / minor revisions / major revisions / reject) and make that bold.

For example:

*Congratulations on your excellent manuscript of fat oxidation disorders in children. The authors give a clear overview of the current knowledge and recent developments in this interesting field of medicine. Overall, the article is readable and definitely interesting to (bio)medical students. Even though some changes to the order of the paragraphs would improve the article, it is easy to understand. In some parts, the information provided was too detailed, but in my opinion there was no missing information. In general, this was a very good article and therefore I would accept it with **minor revisions**.*

Major revisions (if applicable)

Here you state the major changes that you think would improve the article. Also mention important mistakes the author made. Also pay attention to the maximum word count (3,000 words)

Points you should address here include:

- The appropriateness of the manuscript for the journal; if not appropriate, the paper cannot be accepted regardless of its scientific merit.
- Is the experimental question *significant*? If not, the other issues are not relevant.
- Is a clear and testable hypothesis presented?
- Is the overall experimental approach (including subjects, study design, key methods, and data analysis) valid?
- Are the results properly presented and believable?
- Are the conclusions reasonable on the basis of the results obtained (i.e., have the experimental data been properly interpreted)?
- Are the major findings both novel and important (i.e., has sufficient new knowledge been gained)?

A more extensive overview of questions to consider is provided at the end of this guide. Try to formulate the revisions as objectively as possible and keep in mind that it is your job to help the author improve the article, not to criticise everything that he or she has worked hard to produce.

For example:

- *The current word count for the article is 4,352 words, while the maximum permitted is 3,000. Your methods section is too detailed for the average RAMS reader and I would suggest instead making a summary and providing the extensive description as an appendix. Furthermore, you repeat your argument about the relation between temperature and energy need (first mentioned on page 4, line 24) a lot (page 5, line 30; page 7 line 2; page 8 line 10). Please try to prevent too much repetition.*
- *Your introduction starts too detailed. Remember that the average RAMS reader does not know what carnitine is. Try to start with the bigger picture and then focus in on your own subject.*
- *In your results no significant differences were found. However, you seem to use the tendency towards significance (p 0,05-0,10) as an equally valid argument. This is not true. I would suggest to make the paragraphs on this 'tendency towards significance' more objective and not use it as a strong argument.*

Minor revisions (if applicable)

In this section, please provide a detailed overview of smaller changes you think would improve the article. These changes include spelling mistakes, unclear sentences / formulations, abbreviations that are not explained, small changes to the order of the paragraphs, etc. Also, please pay attention to the reference style.

For example:

- *Title: your title does not adequately describe the subject, please include the patient population*
- *Page 2: In your abstract, please use the same subheadings as in your article*
- *Page 2, line 3: change 'hael' to 'heal'*
- *Page 4, line 7: this is the first time you mention MSUD. Please first state what the abbreviation stands for and then the abbreviation itself. So please change 'MSUD' to 'Maple Syrup Urine Disease (MSUD)'. , You can then continue to use the abbreviation within the remainder of the manuscript.*
- *Page 4, line 20-41: this is a description of your methods and belongs in the methods section of your manuscript*
- *Page 7, line 3-17: it would make more sense if you first mention your argument on age differences. Please change the order.*

Appendix 1: Extensive overview of questions to consider when reviewing a manuscript

Title:

- Does the title accurately reflect the purpose, design, results, and conclusions of the study?

Abstract:

- Does the abstract demonstrate the most important information of the paper?
- Is this a succinct, clear, and comprehensive summary of the main text of the paper?
- Is the content (data, conclusions, etc.) consistent with that presented in the main text?
- Is any data or other key information presented here, but not in the main text (or vice versa)?

Opmerking [SE1]: To make more logical sense, this should be added into the 'Abstract' section at the start of this list.

Introduction

- How is the subject introduced?
- Does the introduction state what is known and unknown about the topic?
- Are the objectives of the paper clear?
- Is the specific experimental question, goal or aim stated?

Methods

- Subjects
 - o Are they adequately described? (Do you know everything you want to know about them?)
 - o Are they appropriate for the question posed?
 - o Will the subject population allow limited or extended generalisation?
 - o Are proper control groups/conditions included? Are subjects randomised to conditions?
- Experimental design
 - o Does the experimental design allow the hypothesis to be tested or is there a better experimental approach?
 - o Does the experimental design control for confounding factors? In other words does it isolate the mechanism or factor of interest?
 - o Is the experiment described sufficiently to repeat the study?
- Measures
 - o Are the measurement techniques that were used valid, reliable, sufficient and precise?
- Data analyses and Statistics:
 - o Were investigators blinded?
 - o Is it clear how data will be interpreted to either support or refuse the hypotheses?
 - o Are the statistics used appropriate for the study design?
 - o Are the alpha levels (or the significance level) used to determine statistical significance clearly stated?

Results

- Are the results clearly presented?
- Are results presented on any measures that were not described in the methods or are results missing?
- Are standard deviations or standard errors noted? Is there an excessive variability in one of the measures?
- Does data seem reasonable from a physiological perspective?
- Tables and figures
 - o Are all tables and figures needed?
 - o Are all tables and figures clear and is the scaling appropriate?

- Are no conclusions made?

Discussion

- Are the conclusions valid and properly supported by the results?
- Are there any other ways to interpret the results than that suggested by the authors?
- Are the important experimental limitations of the study described so that the reader will be able to interpret the findings appropriately?
- Is the significance of the present results described? Is it clear how the findings extend previous knowledge in a meaningful way?

References

- Does the article that is referred to contain the mentioned information?
- Is the reference style compatible with the style of the journal?