



Reviewer Checklist

Is the topic of this submission pertinent to the readers of this journal?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

Does this submission present an original idea or contribute to the existing literature?

- Yes
- No, but these points can be addressed with revisions
- No, and it has fundamental issues that cannot be addressed with revisions

Comments:

Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Is the topic presented in a clear, readable manner with appropriate organization of ideas, language use, and grammar?

- Yes
- No, it needs language corrections
- No, it needs better organization
- No, it needs extensive editing

Comments:

Do you have any ethical concerns (e.g., lack of informed consent or institutional review board approval or nonadherence to confidentiality standards or potential conflict of interest)?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

Does the submission's title clearly reflect its content?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

Is the abstract (if applicable to category) appropriately structured and concise, and does it sufficiently reflect the content of the manuscript?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Does the introductory text present the purpose of the manuscript, and is the purpose supported by the pertinent literature? Are the goals, objectives, and hypotheses clearly stated?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

Comments:

Are the methods described sufficiently to allow the study to be repeated by others?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Are the results clearly presented in a manner that is not overly complicated or repetitive with tables/figures?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Is the use of statistics appropriate and clearly described?

- Yes
- No
- Unable to assess; recommend statistical consultation
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Were the objectives of the manuscript achieved?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

Are the findings placed within the context of the existing literature?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Are limitations discussed?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Are the conclusions balanced and representative of the findings?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Are the references appropriate and up to date, with sufficient details provided for locating the sources?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

Are the tables/figures well designed and useful (e.g., appropriately depict results, comprehensive legends, defined abbreviations, explanation of statistical tests/scales used)?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable to this submission

Comments:

Overall Comments

What are the strengths of this manuscript?

What are the major problems of this manuscript?

What are the minor problems of this manuscript?

Additional Reviewer Resources

- On the Art and Science of Peer Review (*free to read via doi: [10.1007/s40596-022-01608-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-022-01608-1)*)
- Institutional Review Board Approval as an Educational Tool (*free to read via doi: [10.1007/s40596-019-01027-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-019-01027-9)*)
- Practical Advice for Preventing Problems When Referencing the Literature (*free to read via doi: [10.1007/s40596-023-01920-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-023-01920-4)*)
- Some Potential “Pitfalls” in the Construction of Educational Systematic Reviews (*free to read via doi: [10.1007/s40596-017-0675-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-017-0675-7)*)
- Educational Case Reports: Purpose, Style, and Format (*free to read via doi: [10.1007/s40596-022-01610-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-022-01610-7)*)
- Writing and Reviewing for the “Down to Earth” Academic Skills Column of Academic Psychiatry (*free to read via doi: [10.1007/s40596-023-01742-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-023-01742-4)*)