Endovascular Resuscitation and Trauma Management

REVIEWING A MANUSCRIPT SUBMITTED TO JEVTM

First of all, we encourage reviewers to adopt an unbiased attitude toward the manuscript under review and to strive to be an author's ally, with the aim to facilitate effective and accurate scientific communication.

☐ **I hereby state that I have no conflict of interest in reviewing this paper.**

In an effort to standardize the review process for the Journal of Endovascular Resuscitation and Trauma Management, we ask that you answer the following questions:

What aspects of the paper did you review (please select one or more options and if relevant, explain why you excluded any aspect)

☐ Logic ☐ Figures ☐ Methods ☐ Language ☐ References

Free text:

Was the topic addressed in this manuscript worthy of investigation? If No, please describe why.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

Does the study address an important unsolved problem of clinical relevance or a basic scientific topic relevant to endovascular resuscitation and trauma management? If No, please describe why.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

Was the information presented in the paper new? If No, please describe why.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

Do you think that there is sufficient evidence to justify the study? If No, please describe why.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

What do you think about the Abstract? (1=Poor, 5=Outstanding)

☐ N/A ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

- ☐ The abstract is concise and structured and does not cite references.
- ☐ The abstract contains subheadings for Background, Methods, Results and Conclusions.
- ☐ The abstract is no longer than 250 words.
- ☐ The abstract includes three to six keywords.

Free text:

What do you think about the Introduction? (1=Poor, 5=Outstanding)

☐ N/A ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

- ☐ The introduction is concisely presenting the background to the problem addressed in the paper.
- ☐ The introduction concludes with a clear hypothesis.
- ☐ Abbreviations are defined at their first mention in the text.

Free text:

What do you think about the Method section? (1=Poor, 5=Outstanding)

☐ N/A ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

- ☐ The clinical population or laboratory model to be discussed is described and justified concisely.
- ☐ Inclusion and exclusion criteria is carefully described where appropriate.
- ☐ Where appropriate, a power calculation was done.
- ☐ Experimental design permits appropriate statistical assessment and ensures that the research question(s) being asked can be answered.
- ☐ In longitudinal clinical studies, the patients are stratified by year and studied to account for changes in clinical care that occur over time.
- ☐ Selected variables and outcome measures are suitable to the study purpose or hypothesis.
- ☐ All variables that may influence findings are controlled (as far as possible).
- ☐ Variables of interest are listed, assay procedures are described, and scientific devices are identified.
- ☐ Analytical methods and statistical assays are pre-planned and appropriate for the experimental design.
- ☐ Manuscript text contains statement about institutional approval of a study, as well as adherence to guidelines on the treatment of animals and human subjects.
- ☐ A section describing ethical approvals and informed consent is included where needed.

Free text:

What do you think about the Result section? (1=Poor, 5=Outstanding)

☐ N/A ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

- ☐ Results are presented in a logical, systematic fashion.
- ☐ Values of each measured variable are stated with error limits and statistical significance.

Free text:

What do you think about the Discussion? (1=Poor, 5=Outstanding)

☐ N/A ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

- ☐ The reported findings are interpreted and related to the stated hypothesis.
- ☐ The results are compared to previous similar work and placed in a clinical or physiologic perspective.
- ☐ Potential study limitations are addressed.
- ☐ The significance of the work is clearly stated.
- ☐ The conclusions are supported by the data.
- ☐ Conclusions are succinct and confined to the study being reported, and avoids reference to other unrelated studies.
- ☐ The authors refrain from imputing significance when statistical assessment does not reach the level of significance.
- ☐ For clinical studies, the conclusions emphasize how the findings might influence patient management or outcome.
- ☐ For laboratory studies, the conclusions suggest how findings shed light on the understanding of biologic processes and disease mechanisms.

Free text:

What do you think about the figures/tables? (1=Poor, 5=Outstanding)

☐ N/A ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

- ☐ Figures are high-quality and enhance the understanding of the discussed topic.
- ☐ There are no redundant figures or figures that are insufficient to illustrate the concept.
- ☐ Figure and table legends are easy to read and clearly labeled.
- ☐ Abbreviations are clearly defined in each table and figure legend.
- ☐ Tables are clearly annotated with conventional symbols for statistical significance.
- ☐ Digits in the figures/tables match what is written in the text.

Free text:

What do you think about the references? (1=Poor, 5=Outstanding)

☐ N/A ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

- ☐ The references follow the Vancouver style and are presented numerically in sequential order within the text using squared brackets, e.g. [1] or [1-3].
- ☐ Where there are more than six authors, the first three are included followed by et al.

Free text:

Are there any structural issues in the manuscript? If so, please describe them.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

Are there sections describing "Ethics statement", "Conflict of interest", "Funding" and "Author contributions" included to the manuscript?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

Did this paper make sense? If No, please describe why.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

Would you recommend this paper to a peer? If No, please describe why.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

Would you read this paper again? If No, please describe why.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Free text:

Endovascular Resuscitation and Trauma Management

Letter Grades

Reviewers are asked to assign a letter grade to manuscripts under review. This grade is intended to help the editors interpret assessments and deliver decisions to authors more quickly and with less ambiguity.

- ☐ **P** = Superb – the manuscript addresses an important clinical or basic science question with interesting findings that confirm previous work (Publication recommended).
- ☐ **PR** = Adequate – the manuscript addresses an interesting clinical or basic science question that confirms previous work (Publication recommended pending revision).
- ☐ **RV** = Weak – the manuscript addresses an interesting clinical or basic science question, but has significant weaknesses that needs to be addressed before a decision can be made (Publication not recommended before a revised version of the manuscript has been seen).
- ☐ **I** = Inappropriate for the following reason(s):
  - ☐ Does not address an important clinical or basic science question
  - ☐ Does not present any new or significant findings
  - ☐ Unrelevant to the scope of the Journal of Endovascular Resuscitation and Trauma Management

Thank you for the effort and collaboration

The JEVTM editors and team