EDITOR-IN-CHIEF	
Tomas Jose Silber, MD, MASS	

EDITORIAL BOARD

EXECUTIVE EDITOR Stowe Locke Teti, HEC-C

Douglas Diekema MD, MPH Jacqueline Glover PhD John Lantos MD Mark Mercurio MD, MA Christine Mitchell RN, MS, MTS Jonathon Moreno PhD Lainie Ross MD, PhD Cynda Rushton PhD, RN, FAAN Yoram Unguru MD, MS, MA



## MANUSCRIPT REVIEW WORKSHEET

MANUSCRIPT No.	REVIEWER INITIALS	DATE REC'D	DATE COMP'L

Please note: not all categories will apply to all manuscripts; use your discretion as to which are appropriate.

- 1. Items 1-7: Rate manuscript by selecting the adjacent checkbox. Category-specific comments are optional.
- 2. Item 8: Provide your overall impression of the manuscript, for Editorial Use Only.
- 3. 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

EXECUTIVE EDITOR Stowe Locke Teti, HEC-C

EDITORIAL BOARD Douglas Diekema MD, MPH Jacqueline Glover PhD John Lantos MD Mark Mercurio MD, MA Christine Mitchell RN, MS, MTS Jonathon Moreno PhD Lainie Ross MD, PhD Cynda Rushton PhD, RN, FAAN Yoram Unguru MD, MS, MA



Center for Bioethics I Harvard Medical School 641 Huntington Avenue | Boston, MA 02115 Office: 617.432.8358 | Direct 240.997.1337 https://pediatricethicscope.org

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

1.	Not sufficient
2.	Sufficient
2	

- 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

EDITORIAL BOARD

EXECUTIVE EDITOR Stowe Locke Teti, HEC-C

Douglas Diekema MD, MPH Jacqueline Glover PhD John Lantos MD Mark Mercurio MD, MA Christine Mitchell RN, MS, MTS Jonathon Moreno PhD Lainie Ross MD, PhD Cynda Rushton PhD, RN, FAAN Yoram Unguru MD, MS, MA



Center for Bioethics I Harvard Medical School 641 Huntington Avenue | Boston, MA 02115 Office: 617.432.8358 | Direct 240.997.1337 https://pediatricethicscope.org

- 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 category specific comments with the Author.

EDITORIAL BOARD

EXECUTIVE EDITOR Stowe Locke Teti, HEC-C

Douglas Diekema MD, MPH Jacqueline Glover PhD John Lantos MD Mark Mercurio MD, MA Christine Mitchell RN, MS, MTS Jonathon Moreno PhD Lainie Ross MD, PhD Cynda Rushton PhD, RN, FAAN Yoram Unguru MD, MS, MA



Center for Bioethics I Harvard Medical School 641 Huntington Avenue | Boston, MA 02115 Office: 617.432.8358 | Direct 240.997.1337 https://pediatricethicscope.org

## 9. General comments to be shared with the Author:

Thank you for participating in the PEDIATRIC ETHICSCOPE peer-review process. For questions, contact Stowe Teti at stowe\_teti@hms.harvard.edu