

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW WORKSHEET

MANUSCRIPT No.

REVIEWER INITIALS

DATE REC'D

DATE COMPL

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

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 category 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.
For questions, contact Stowe Teti at stowe_teti@hms.harvard.edu