

PROCEDURE:
**MANUSCRIPT REVIEW
WORKSHEET**

MANUSCRIPT No.

REVIEWER INITIALS

DATE REC'D

DATE COMP'L

1. Items 1-7: Rate manuscript in the following seven categories by clicking on the adjacent check box.
2. Comments (optional) may be entered beneath each category. Ratings will not be shared, but you may choose to share your comments from this section with the author.
3. Item 8: Provide your overall impression of the manuscript, for Editorial Use Only.
4. Item 9: List any comments to be shared with the author.

1. The manuscript's value as a contribution to the literature is:

☐
☐
☐

1. Minimal
2. Moderate
3. High

2. The strength of the case(s), example(s), or evidence presented in the manuscript is(are):

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

1. Not Acceptable
2. Acceptable
3. Sufficient
4. Extensive
5. Emblematic of the issue

3. The alternative positions to the position argued in the manuscript (if applicable) are:

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

1. Not sufficiently accurate/articulated
2. Somewhat accurate/articulated
3. Sufficiently accurate/articulated
4. Accurate, well-articulated; primary alternative positions discussed
5. Accurate, well-articulated and circumscribe alternative thinking in the field

4. Evidentiary support of matters of fact throughout the manuscript is:

- ☐ 1. Not sufficient
- ☐ 2. Sufficient
- ☐ 3. Reasonable
- ☐ 4. Strong
- ☐ 5. Extensive

5. Support of normative content such as ethical and bioethical argument(s) is/are:

- ☐ 1. Not sufficient
- ☐ 2. Acceptable
- ☐ 3. Reasonable, through example or textual references
- ☐ 4. Strong, through example or textual references
- ☐ 5. Extensive, with attributions to their originators or well-known proponents

6. The Conclusion, as a necessary or reasonable consequence of the premise and argument, is:

- ☐ 1. Not validly drawn
- ☐ 2. Missing minor elements to be valid
- ☐ 3. Validly drawn
- ☐ 4. Validly drawn and convincing
- ☐ 5. Validly drawn, convincing, and deeply perceptive

7. The overall quality of the writing in the manuscript, is:

- ☐ 1. Needs work
- ☐ 2. Clear and concise
- ☐ 3. Clear, concise, and artful
- ☐ 4. A joy to read
- ☐ 5. Sublime

8. Overall Impression for the manuscript under consideration: (CONFIDENTIAL)

☐ Share my specific comments with the Author.

9. General comments to be shared with the Author:

Thank you for participating in the PEDIATRIC ETHICSCOPE peer-review process.