

## JGPT Reviewer ‘Read-along’ Template

REVIEW SECTIONS	Does the author need to improve this section? If so, how?
<p><b>TITLE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concisely &amp; accurately conveys what was done in the study</li> <li>• Includes the population(s) under study (community-dwelling, hospitalized, etc.)</li> <li>• Includes type of study if appropriate (RCT, Systematic Review, etc.)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>ABSTRACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concisely &amp; accurately summarizes the study &amp; major findings; avoids excessive detail</li> <li>• Background               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identifies the problem</li> <li>○ States the purpose of the study</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Methods               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States the study design, population(s), setting(s) if appropriate</li> <li>○ Explains group allocation if appropriate</li> <li>○ Identifies all measures used, when &amp; where measures were taken, etc.</li> <li>○ Describes any intervention(s) provided including mode &amp; dose (frequency, intensity, duration, etc.)</li> <li>○ Indicates the type of statistical analysis used</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reports statistical significance of results</li> <li>○ Reports clinical significance of results</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Conclusions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Succinctly describes what the major study findings mean</li> <li>○ Includes a statement of clinical relevance or impact</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well-organized; proceeds in a logical sequence to lead the reader to the study purpose and/or hypotheses</li> <li>• Identifies the important problem to be addressed</li> <li>• Demonstrates a strong grasp of the prior literature through a summary description of <i>what is already known</i></li> <li>• Explains <i>what is NOT known</i> (identifies knowledge gap)</li> <li>• Presents a strong rationale for <i>why it is important to address the knowledge gap</i>; Why is it crucial to conduct this study?</li> <li>• States the purpose(s) of the study; this may include one or more hypotheses to be investigated</li> <li>• Explains why it would be <i>clinically valuable</i> to know the answer(s) to the question(s)</li> </ul>	

## METHODS

- Specifies the type of study design
  - Is this the correct design to use to test the hypotheses & answer the question(s)?
  - Retrospective? Prospective?
- Study IRB approved?
- If intervention study (clinical trial), registration number provided?
- Identifies the study population(s)
- Indicates how participants were recruited, & from where
- Presents inclusion and exclusion criteria
- Informed consent obtained?
- If groups were created, how was group allocation accomplished?
  - Was this allocation method free of bias? Does it avoid exerting a systematic influence on the outcome? (e.g., concurrent or consecutive enrollment)
- Reports that the necessary sample size was calculated beforehand ('a priori') in order to achieve a statistical power of at least 0.80 (80%) at a minimum, higher is better.
- Describes each test or measure used to measure or predict outcomes
  - Are standardized measures used?
  - Are client-centered measures used (alone or in combination with other measures; e.g., activity-level, participation level, or QoL measures)?
  - For each measure, is the established validity, reliability,

and Minimal Detectable Change (MDC) reported?

- Describes the testing process
  - When and how many times the tests were conducted
  - Who administered the tests; were they trained to do this?
  - Were testers blinded to group allocation?
- If participants were followed over time, indicates how outcomes were determined (re-testing, telephone interview, diary, review of documentation, etc.)
- Describes the intervention so explicitly it could be replicated (if lengthy, use of appendices or supplemental digital content is acceptable; if previously published, use of citation is acceptable following a brief summary)
  - Includes mode and dose (frequency, intensity and duration)
  - If mode was different between groups, was dose held constant for both groups?
  - Was the dose provided adequate to produce change?
  - Who delivered the intervention? Were they blinded to prior test results? Were they trained to deliver the intervention properly?
- Explains what statistical analyses were used
  - Were these appropriate for the data? Correctly selected?
  - If there were multiple outcome variables, were they analyzed

<p>with a multivariate omnibus test (e.g., MANOVA), followed by univariate tests, followed by post hoc tests? Did they control for baseline differences? For Type I or Family-wise error?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If outcome measures were conducted on multiple occasions, was a repeated measures design used?</li> <li>○ If there were multiple comparisons or multiple correlations, was statistical correction applied to control error rate (e.g., Bonferroni, Benjamini-Hochberg, etc.)?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>RESULTS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● States results clearly, in a logical &amp; consistent sequence</li> <li>● Were groups equivalent on all influential characteristics and outcome measures at baseline? If not, was this difference controlled for statistically?</li> <li>● For each dependent variable, reports the actual statistical power of the analysis to detect differences/associations. If non-significant findings are reported and the power is &lt; 0.80 (80%), the study was underpowered to find differences or associations that may actually exist.</li> <li>● If this is a RCT or longitudinal study, is a CONSORT (or other similar) flow chart illustrating the progress of participants through the study included?</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports statistical significance/non-significance (within- and between-groups) using actual p-values (versus just &lt;0.05 or &lt;0.01; with the exception of &lt;0.001)</li> <li>• Reports clinical significance/non-significance (within- and between-groups); amount of change relative to the MDC or MCID, effect size, etc.</li> <li>• Includes data details in Tables; for each outcome variable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Units of measurement are stated</li> <li>○ When appropriate, includes means/medians, SDs or SE's, confidence intervals, p-values, power to detect differences/associations; effect sizes, whether or not the MDC was met or exceeded.</li> <li>○ When appropriate, includes relative risk (RR) or odds ratio (OR)</li> <li>○ When appropriate, includes AUC, sensitivity, specificity, positive &amp; negative likelihood ratios, positive &amp; negative post-test probabilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If appropriate, illustrates testing, intervention, and/or results using figures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If graphs, axes are labeled with units of measurement</li> <li>○ Would additional figures help the reader understand the study better?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>DISCUSSION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Briefly</u> summarizes the major statistically significant/non-significant and clinically significant/non-significant findings, stating significant findings first.</li> <li>• Relates the findings to the original question(s) or hypotheses</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains the <i>meaning</i> of the findings</li> <li>• Explicitly addresses the clinical implications of the findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How should findings be applied clinically?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Discusses the degree to which these new findings fit with what was already known</li> <li>• If findings different than prior studies, provides possible reasons for the differences</li> <li>• Includes a Limitations section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strengths of the study</li> <li>○ Weaknesses of the study, and how these may have influenced study results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sources of bias</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggests possible future research directions</li> </ul>	
<p><b>CONCLUSION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Briefly</u> summarizes the meaning of the findings</li> <li>• Clearly states the clinical relevance of the work</li> </ul>	
<p><b>REFERENCES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the majority recent (last 10 years)?</li> <li>• Are any important references missing?</li> <li>• Do the references actually support the points made in the text?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>THROUGHOUT THE MANUSCRIPT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you consider the use of written English in this paper to be “publication ready”? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If not, <i>do not spend a great deal of your time copy-editing the manuscript; tell the author if it is</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<p><i>inadequate.</i> Provide a few select examples. It is the author's responsibility to have their paper proof-read and copy-edited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Was unsupported opinion and conjecture avoided?</li><li>• Was there any apparent bias that went unrecognized or wasn't mentioned?</li><li>• Did each paragraph proceed logically to the next? Or were there 'jumps' from "Point A" to 'Point C' where an interim paragraph would help the reader follow?</li></ul>	
---	--