Peer Review Guidelines for Panorama: A Biomedical Perspective

Thank you for agreeing to review manuscripts for Panorama. Panorama is a peer-reviewed publication focusing on presenting biomedical research topics in an approachable form for the diverse audience in the broad fields of biomedical research. Reaching this goal requires some adjustment to typical academic reviews. As in any academic review, issues of scientific quality are paramount. However, addressing the lay audience introduces additional challenges. Please read the evaluation guidelines below carefully before beginning your review.

General Structure
- Summarize in 2-3 sentences what the article is about.
- General comments
- Specific comments (Tied to specific line numbers)
- Table of scores (see below)
- Recommendation

Evaluation Guidelines

- Academic merit
  - Scientific Quality
    - Is the technical content accurate?
    - Are the conclusions supported by the data and methodology?
  - Impact
    - Does the work include novel content?
    - Is the scope sufficiently broad?
    - Do authors discuss clinical relevance/translational potential?
- Audience
  - Language
    - Is the article is in layperson's terms?
    - Is there jargon that would not be understood by the general audience?
    - Does the simplification of language obscure the science?
  - Background
    - Is sufficient background included to put the work in context for the lay audience?
  - Figures
    - Are the figures simple enough to be understood ?
    - Are the captions sufficiently informative (expect more detail than in typical manuscripts)?
  - References
    - Is there enough reference to related work

- Clarity
  - Is the organization of the work appropriate?

- The general structure we recommend includes Background, Overview of the field, Context of the work, Details of the work, and Future of the field sections

Additional Comments
- Focus on the academic merit of the article before addressing any grammatical errors and typos.
- When you are commenting, provide specific paragraph and line references to the article (e.g. in line 153, beginning "Penicillin is an important..."). If you are citing conflicting evidence from literature, include specific references (Author, Journal, issue/date) – editorial reference list following comments may be useful for summarizing large number of editorial references.
- If the article is poorly organized, suggest an alternative way to organize it.
- If an article does not adhere to the length limits in the submission guidelines (approximately 1500 words), it would be helpful to suggest how the article can be made more concise and identify unnecessary figures.
- When reviewing the discussion section, consider the following points:
    - Do the authors provide an adequate scientific framework so that readers can understand why their findings are important?
    - Are the conclusions based on speculations, rather than results?
    - Do the authors discuss how their findings can be translational? (bench to bedside or vice-versa)

- Specific issues to look for:
    - Suitable title reflecting purpose or conclusions of study?
    - Is the abstract succinct? Is the content consistent with the results presented in main article?
    - Data added (not presented in main text) or important data missing?
    - Does the introduction give an academic overview and does not miss critical findings from previous studies?
    - Detailed description of methods lacking, or acronyms undefined
    - Flawed experimental design
    - Sufficient or insufficient technical standard
    - Lack of major controls (positive or negative)
    - If article is particularly long, are all tables and figures needed?
    - Are figure captions/scaling appropriate? Are units of measure correct?
    - Has data been properly treated / adjusted statistically?
    - Discussion of study limitations / avenue for future work?
    - Conflicts of interest (scientific or monetary)?

- Table of scores:

Aspect	*Score	Comments
Novelty		

Significance		
Clinical impact		
Clarity		
Presentation -Whether the article is in layperson's terms.		
Adequate References		
*Recommendation		

*Score categories:

                5 – Excellent
                4 – Very good
                3 – Good
                2 – Average
                1 – Poor
                0 – Very poor

*Recommendation:

- Accept
- Accept with minor revisions
- Accept with major revisions
- Reject

Version date: October 22, 2011