Feedback Guide for RIME Papers

Please use the questions below to provide feedback on the manuscript reviewed. After answering each question, provide suggestions to the author on how to improve the paper.

First summarize the manuscript to the author in 3 to 4 sentences, to be sure you understood it correctly. This is a good check for the clarity of the writing! Then address the questions.

1. **Relevance** - Is the manuscript relevant to the journal's audience? If not, how can it be made relevant, or should it be sent to another journal?

2. **Innovation** – Does the manuscript describe a new idea or intervention or results previously unpublished? If not, how can the manuscript send a message that improves how its reader can do things?

Review of sections of manuscript (parenthesis summarizes guidelines for that section)

3. **Abstract (**This is a summary of the paper under the headings 'Objectives', 'Methods', 'Results' and 'Conclusions' that is no more than 200 words long) – Does the abstract accurately reflect the study and its findings? If not how can it be improved?

4. **Introduction (**No more than 3 paragraphs. Why is this area of study important? What is the current state of knowledge? Where are the gaps? Avoid a full lit review at this stage and leave most of that for the Discussion. The last paragraph should explicitly state the aims of the study.) – Does the Introduction convince you of the need for the study? If not what should the author do to make it more compelling?

5. **Methods (**Should address <u>Study design:</u> What type of study is it? <u>Setting:</u> Where was it conducted? What are the special features of this setting? <u>Selection of patients:</u> What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria? How were subjects identified? <u>Data Collected:</u> This should describe all the data collected. <u>Outcomes measures:</u> primary outcomes - behaviors? Knowledge? Skills? Were there any secondary outcomes? <u>Data Analysis:</u> What types of analyses were performed using what tests? <u>Ethics approval.</u> There should be a statement saying that the study was approved) – Are all sections complete for Methods? Are tools that were used clearly described and their validation described? Is the statistical analysis adequately described? What information is missing and what should be added?

6. **Results** (Describe the study population, primary and secondary outcomes and statistical values and subgroup analyse. These should align with your objectives). Did the Results match Methods section? Are results clearly presented for primary, secondary outcomes and subgroup analyses? Are tables or figures clearly presented (i.e. if detached from paper can be understood without referring to the text)? Are both internal and external validity addressed?

7. **Discussion and Conclusions (**statement of principal findings, how they compare with other research. Where do they agree or disagree, meaning of the study, possible explanations and implications of all of the available data, unanswered questions and future research, strengths and limitations of the study) – Do the findings justify the Conclusions? Are limitations sufficiently addressed? Are future studies suggested? Suggest how the author can improve on this section.

8. Is there a clear message that emerges from the manuscript? What is the message?

9. If you were the editor, what else would you suggest to improve the manuscript?