



At First Glance

# What we will cover:

1. Approaching a review
2. 4-step method
3. Assessing an abstract
4. Assessing a title
5. Assessing references





# 1. Approaching a Review

### 1. Guidelines & Goals

#### 2. 4-step method

1. Broad read
2. First detailed read
3. Second detailed read
4. Concluding statement

- Check for journal guidelines
- Understand the aims and scope of the journal
- Check the peer review site



Instructions

Details

Score Sheet

Title: Theorization of transfer of training: the role of trainee intentions

Manuscript ID: pEWO-2009-0107

Authors: *blinded*

Manuscript Type: Original Article

Date Submitted: *blinded*

Total Time in Review: 39 days, 21 hours

Status: AE: Schyns, Birgit  
EO: Nicholas, Duncan

• Awaiting Reviewer Comments

HTML

PDF

Abstract

External Searches

Rating

Please evaluate the manuscript using the rating scale:

	Not acceptable	Barely acceptable	Acceptable	Good
Review of literature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Methodological adequacy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Clarity of expression	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Theoretical importance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Contribution to knowledge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Practical relevance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

REQ Recommendation

☐ Accept
 ☐ Minor Revision
 ☐ Revise
 ☐ Reject, Revise and Resubmit
 ☐ Reject

Comments

Confidential Comments to the Editors

HTML

PDF

Abstract

External Searches

Yes

No

REQ 1) Does the subject of the paper fall within the scope of the journal?

☐

☐

REQ 2) Is the content of sufficient interest to justify the length of the paper?

☐

☐

REQ 3) Are the title and abstract adequate?

☐

☐

REQ 4) Are all the diagrams, photographs and tables essential?

☐

☐

REQ 5) Are the text and mathematical arguments, if any, as brief as is consistent with clarity? (If you recommend that the paper be shortened, please indicate briefly which parts of the text can be reduced or which tables or illustrations can be omitted.)

☐

☐

REQ Recommendation

☐ Accept
 ☐ Minor Revision
 ☐ Major Revision
 ☐ Reject

Comments

CONFIDENTIAL Comments to the Editor

Comments to the Author

Attach a File

Browse...

No file selected.

Attach

Files attached

• No files have been uploaded.

Save as Draft

Submit

Print Saved Version

Top 10%

Top 20%

Top 30%

Top 40%

Top 50%

Lower 50%

Please Evaluate the Manuscript Relative to Other Work in the Area:	Top 10%	Top 20%	Top 30%	Top 40%	Top 50%	Lower 50%
Originality of Research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Significance of Research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Experimental Methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quality of Results	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Anonymity

☒ I prefer to remain anonymous
 ☐ You may reveal my identity to both the authors and other reviewers

REQ Recommendation

☐ Accept
 ☐ Minor Revision
 ☐ Major Revision
 ☐ Reject & Resubmit
 ☐ Reject

R1 Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

☐ Yes
 ☐ No

Comments

Confidential Comments to the Editors

REQ Comments to the Author

Please only attach a file of your review if it contains figures, tables or specialist formatting.





## 2. 4-Step Method

1. Guidelines & Goals

**2. 4-step method**

1. Broad read
2. First detailed read
3. Second detailed read
4. Concluding statement

- 1 – Broad read through
- 2 - First detailed read
- 3 – Second detailed read
- 4 - Concluding statement



1. Guidelines & Goals
2. 4-step method
  1. **Broad read**
  2. First detailed read
  3. Second detailed read
  4. Concluding statement

- 1 – Broad read through
  - Scan to familiarise yourself with the paper
  - Abstract
  - Headings and structure
  - Style of writing
  - Figures & tables





1. Guidelines & Goals
2. 4-step method
  1. Broad read
  2. **First detailed read**
  3. Second detailed read
  4. Concluding statement

- 2 - First detailed read
  - Structure
  - Originality
  - Overall quality
  - Readability
  - Headline questions and concerns
  - Revision suggestions



1. Guidelines & Goals
2. 4-step method
  1. Broad read
  2. First detailed read
  3. **Second detailed read**
  4. Concluding statement

- 3 – Second detailed read
  - Smaller issues
  - Grammar and typos
  - Appropriate references



1. Guidelines & Goals
2. 4-step method
  1. Broad read
  2. First detailed read
  3. Second detailed read
  4. **Concluding statement**

- 4 - Concluding statement
  - Key positives
  - Key shortcomings
  - Main areas for revision
  - Potential contribution to the field



*“This is an engaging article with robust methodology that purposefully questions our knowledge of the subject. However, the presentation of results is somewhat confusing, and the readability of the discussion could be improved. Addressing both these issues will make this paper more impactful.”*





### 3. Abstract

# Abstract: at first glance

- Does this article match your area of expertise?
- This is a summary of the article



# Abstract: what to comment on

- Does the main article match the abstract?
- Is the aim/research question clear?
- Is the methodology outlined?
- Do results and conclusions align with the aim?
- Does the title convey the main idea?



# The Darwin Awards: sex differences in idiotic behaviour



OPEN ACCESS

Ben Alexander Daniel Lendrem *student*<sup>1</sup>, Dennis William Lendrem *project manager, Institute of Cellular Medicine*<sup>2</sup>, Andy Gray *consultant orthopaedic trauma surgeon*<sup>3</sup>, John Dudley Isaacs *director, Institute of Cellular Medicine*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The King Edward VI School, Morpeth NE61 1DN, UK; <sup>2</sup>Newcastle University, Newcastle NE2 4HH, UK; <sup>3</sup>Major Trauma Centre, Royal Victoria Infirmary, Newcastle NE1 4LP

## Abstract

Sex differences in risk seeking behaviour, emergency hospital admissions, and mortality are well documented. However, little is known about sex differences in idiotic risk taking behaviour. This paper reviews the data on winners of the Darwin Award over a 20 year period (1995-2014). Winners of the Darwin Award must eliminate themselves from the gene pool in such an idiotic manner that their action ensures one less idiot will survive. This paper reports a marked sex difference in Darwin Award winners: males are significantly more likely to receive the award than females ( $P < 0.0001$ ). We discuss some of the reasons for this difference.

According to “male idiot theory” (MIT) many of the differences in risk seeking behaviour, emergency department admissions, and mortality may be explained by the observation that men are idiots and idiots do stupid things.<sup>16</sup> There are anecdotal data supporting MIT, but to date there has been no systematic analysis of sex differences in idiotic risk taking behaviour. In this paper we present evidence in support of this hypothesis using data on idiotic behaviours demonstrated by winners of the Darwin Award.<sup>17-21</sup>

Winners of the Darwin Award must die in such an idiotic manner that “their action ensures the long-term survival of the







## 4. Title

# Title: at first glance

- Does it contain the key features?
- Does it sound interesting?
- Is it an accurate representation of the paper?





## 5. References

# References: at first glance

- Are the references relevant?
- Are the references current?
- Are the references cited correctly?
- And any major references missing?



# Revisit your first glance

- How accurate is the headline information?
- Do the Abstract and Title include 'correct' information?
- Do they misrepresent the paper?





## 6. Summary

# Summary

- Balanced criticism and professionalism
- Considered how we are qualified and capable
- Checked journal requirements and goals
- Introduced a 4-step method for review
- Began reviewing a paper

