

Nephrology Nursing Journal Manuscript Review Form

Manuscript Number:

Date Sent:

Date Due:

This review form is provided to guide reviewers in evaluating manuscripts. Please return this manuscript and review file by the specified due date to: Joe Tonzelli, Editorial Coordinator, NNJ, at Joe@ajj.com. If, for any reason, you cannot review the manuscript and return it by the specified date, please notify Joe immediately (Joe@ajj.com or 856-589-7463).

Please mark 'yes,' 'no,' or 'not applicable' for each criteria. For any answer in a yellow shaded space, please provide comments, suggestions, and answers to questions in the manuscript itself using the 'track changes' feature in MS Word to indicate your questions, suggestions, comments, etc. If unfamiliar with 'track changes,' you may use a bolded, capitalized font within the manuscript preferably in a color other than black.

Your comments will only be seen by the NNJ editors and staff. They will be consolidated with those of other reviewers and the editor before being sent to the author.

	Yes	No	Not Applicable
ORIGINALITY/VALUE			
Is this manuscript characterized by original thinking?			
To your knowledge, has any or all of this manuscript been published elsewhere? If yes, please indicate where.			
Is the topic timely and useful to the reader?			
RELIABILITY/CONTENT			
Is the content theoretically sound? If no, please indicate the areas of concern.			
Have there been major omissions in content? If yes, please indicate what has been omitted.			
Has the author given proper credit for facts, ideas, & theories? If no, please indicate where credit should have been given and to whom.			
Is the content consistent with practical experience? If not, is the inconsistency explained?			
Are the references appropriate, current, and accurate? If no, please indicate the references that are not and, if possible, the references that should be included.			
Did you find errors in facts, interpretations, calculations, tables, or figures? If yes, please identify these.			
Is the summary logical, complete, and clearly stated? If no, what needs to be improved?			
Are the implications for nephrology nursing practice adequately covered? If no, please indicate what is needed.			
Is the summary logical, complete, and clearly stated? If no, what needs to be improved?			
WRITING STYLE			
Does the development of the central idea flow well?			
Is the content appropriately organized and subdivided? If no, please suggest improvements.			
TITLE/ABSTRACT/INTRODUCTION/CONCLUSION/IMPLICATIONS			
Is the title concise, clear, and descriptive of the content? If no, please suggest a new title			
Is the abstract succinct and direct? If no, please recommend improvements.			
Is the introduction clear and concise? If no, please recommend improvements.			
Is the conclusion clear and based on the rest of the manuscript content? If no, please recommend improvements.			
Are implications for nephrology nursing clear and accurate? If no, please recommend improvements.			

RESEARCH CRITERIA - Use only for research manuscripts	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Are methods clearly and adequately explained? If no, what is missing?			
Is the sample adequately described? If no, what else should be included?			
Is the instrument adequately described including its validity and reliability? If no, what needs to be added?			
Is the issue of informed consent adequately covered? If not, what needs to be added?			
Is the data analysis clear? If no, what needs to be improved?			
Are the conclusions appropriate and well supported by data? If no, what needs to be improved?			
Is the discussion clear and complete? If no, what needs to be improved?			
Are the limitations complete and clearly stated? If no, what needs to be improved?			
Is the discussion regarding application to practice complete and clearly stated? If no, what needs to be improved?			
Are the recommendations for future work complete, logical, and clearly stated? If no, what needs to be improved?			

REVIEWER'S RECOMMENDATIONS:

Please select a recommendation option from those listed below. Recommendations should include comments inserted in the manuscript file to substantiate your recommendation and to help us in making revision recommendations to the author(s).

	Yes
1. Accept – only very minor revisions necessary. Please include your recommended revisions in the manuscript file using the MS Word track changes function.	
2. Accept pending revision - some revision/corrections needed. Please include your recommended revisions in the manuscript file using the MS Word track changes function.	
3. Major revision would be required prior to acceptance. Please include your recommended revisions in the manuscript file using the MS Word track changes function.	
4. Reject. Please note in the comments section below or in the manuscript file the reason(s) why you recommend that the manuscript be rejected.	
Would you recommend this article as a CE offering?	

Reviewer Name:

Date:

General Comments: [Note – please include only general comments here – specific comments, questions, and recommendations should be inserted into the manuscript using the track changes function in MSWord.]