

## **Primary Dental Care**

### **Peer Reviewer's Checklist for Papers Reporting Systematic Reviews**

**Paper No: MS... Title:**

#### **Notes for reviewers**

- When answering the following questions please add explanations or comments or recommendations where appropriate. Do not feel constrained to give answers such as yes or no or not applicable when completing the checklist.
- Please phrase these explanations/comments/recommendations in such a way that they can be passed on to the author(s).

#### **General**

1. Is the topic of the paper appropriate for the journal?
2. Does the paper conform to the published guidelines for authors of the journal?
3. Is it on an important or significant topic?
4. Does the study add to the existing knowledge-base?

#### **Presentation**

5. Does the title accurately reflect the content of the paper?
6. Does the paper have a logical construction?
7. Does the length of the paper need adjusting (too long or short)?
8. Is the paper written in a clear and easily understandable style?
9. Is the paper free of grammatical or typographical errors?

#### **Abstract**

10. Is there an abstract that conforms to the journal's published guidelines for authors?
11. Does the abstract present an accurate synopsis of the paper?

#### **Introduction and Aims**

12. Is the introduction appropriate to the paper's subject?
13. Is the literature that has been reviewed, relevant and is it comprehensive?
14. From the introduction does the systematic review seem original in concept?
15. Do the aims of the systematic review follow logically from the introduction and are they clearly stated?

## **Methods**

16. Is the design of the systematic review consistent with its aims?
17. If applicable, was a pilot study performed to test the methodology?
18. Is the method of selecting the studies that were reviewed clearly described?
19. Are other details such as numbers and time periods clearly described and consistent?
20. If relevant, have reviewers been trained and calibrated?
21. Are details of such training and calibration given?

## **Results**

22. Are the results presented in a clear and unambiguous manner.
23. Are the tables, figures, etc clear?
24. Are there any missing data and if so are they accounted for.
25. Is the sample too small to justify the findings ?
26. Are the results believable?

## **Discussion**

27. Does the discussion critique and discuss the methodology used?
28. Does the discussion comprehensively discuss the results?
29. Are the results discussed in relation to other similar systematic reviews in the general area of the review?
30. Does the discussion extend beyond the methods and results of the review?
31. If appropriate, is the need for further work detailed?

## **Conclusions**

32. Do the conclusions accurately reflect the results of the review?
33. Are the conclusions clear set out?

## **Acknowledgements**

34. Is any source of funding identified?
35. Is there a statement of conflict of interest?
36. Is there a statement of exactly how each author contributed to the paper?

## **References**

37. Are the references accurate, up to date and relevant?

## **Additional suggestions to the authors:**

**Reviewer's Recommendation to the editor plus any further comments for the editor only**

Accept  
Accept subject to:

Reject