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**EMS Number:**

**Question: \_**

**Your Scores Min. Score for Rejection Format: 1 or more**

**Evidence Summary Total: Paragraph 1: \_ Paragraph 2: \_ Paragraph 3: \_ Paragraph 4: \_ Paragraph 5: \_**

**5 or more**

**Table: \_ 2 or more**

**Managing Editor Editorial Review – Checklist**

**Red superscript numbers refer to page numbers in the** [**HDA Author Handbook**](https://fpin.memberclicks.net/assets/HDAMemberResources/WritingHDAs/HDA%20Author%20Handbook%20102819.pdf) **providing further information**

**Section 1: Format**

**Manuscript will be rejected for any one infraction on this page**

**Score:**

* Manuscript does NOT meet technical standards:

Author names in manuscript do not match names in EMS (Note: The Corresponding Author in the EMS is required to contribute to the writing of the manuscript. Local Editors who want to evaluate their program’s manuscripts within the EMS can apply for editing privileges in Feb 2019)

Question in manuscript does not match the initial invitation or is absent from the document

Manuscript not submitted as Word document page 5

Word count (Evidence-Based Answer and Evidence Summary) is more than 900 words

* Reference section:

Reference does not contain evidence pertinent to the question

Reference appears to be a narrative/literature review (not a systematic review)

Has only 1 reference or more than 5 references [page5](https://fpin.memberclicks.net/assets/HDAMemberResources/WritingHDAs/HDA%20Author%20Handbook%20102819.pdf)

References not numbered in order of appearance page5

Has no STEP level indicators [page 13](https://fpin.memberclicks.net/assets/HDAMemberResources/WritingHDAs/HDA%20Author%20Handbook%20102819.pdf)

Included as ‘End Notes’ page13

* Evidence Summary:

More than one reference summarized in each paragraph (written in narrative review format) page 3

Citation numbers not listed page8

* Evidence Based Answer:

No EBA

EBA does not directly answer the question page 6

No SOR indicators page 6

Brief explanatory phrases missing from SOR indicators page 6

**COMMENTS:**

**Section 2: Evidence Summary** [**pages 7-6**](https://fpin.memberclicks.net/assets/HDAMemberResources/WritingHDAs/HDA%20Author%20Handbook%20102819.pdf) **|** [**FPIN Institute Module**](https://fpin.memberclicks.net/synthesizing-the-evidence?servId=8681)

# Manuscript will be rejected for any five (5) infractions in this section

**Paragraph 1**

## Score:

* Paragraph summarizing a single study lacks:

research question/topic of the study

study design (RCT, cohort, etc.)

number of patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of intervention and comparator (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a systematic review or meta-analysis lacks:

research question/topic of the study

design of included studies (RCT, cohort, etc.)

total number of included studies

total number of included patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of interventions and comparators (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results with (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a diagnostic study (or meta-analysis of the same) lacks:

description of testing protocol

description of reference standard

prevalence of the disease/condition

numerical results (sensitivity, specificity, likelihood ratios, etc.)

* Paragraph summarizing a practice guideline lacks:

developing organization

development process (consensus or evidence-based)

SOR or level/grade of evidence indicators

**COMMENTS:**

# Paragraph 2

## Score:

* Paragraph summarizing a single study lacks:

research question/topic of the study

study design (RCT, cohort, etc.)

number of patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of intervention and comparator (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a systematic review or meta-analysis lacks:

research question/topic of the study

design of included studies (RCT, cohort, etc.)

total number of included studies

total number of included patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of interventions and comparators (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a diagnostic study (or meta-analysis of the same) lacks:

description of testing protocol

description of reference standard

prevalence of the disease/condition

numerical results (sensitivity, specificity, likelihood ratios, etc.)

* Paragraph summarizing a practice guideline lacks:

developing organization

development process (consensus or evidence-based)

SOR or level/grade of evidence indicators

**COMMENTS:**

# Paragraph 3, if applicable

## Score:

* Paragraph summarizing a single study lacks:

research question/topic of the study

study design (RCT, cohort, etc.)

number of patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of intervention and comparator (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a systematic review or meta-analysis lacks:

research question/topic of the study

design of included studies (RCT, cohort, etc.)

total number of included studies

total number of included patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of interventions and comparators (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a diagnostic study (or meta-analysis of the same) lacks:

description of testing protocol

description of reference standard

prevalence of the disease/condition

numerical results (sensitivity, specificity, likelihood ratios, etc.)

* Paragraph summarizing a practice guideline lacks:

developing organization

development process (consensus or evidence-based)

SOR or level/grade of evidence indicators

**COMMENTS:**

# Paragraph 4, if applicable

## Score:

* Paragraph summarizing a single study lacks:

research question/topic of the study

study design (RCT, cohort, etc.)

number of patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of intervention and comparator (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a systematic review or meta-analysis lacks:

research question/topic of the study

design of included studies (RCT, cohort, etc.)

total number of included studies

total number of included patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of interventions and comparators (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a diagnostic study (or meta-analysis of the same) lacks:

description of testing protocol

description of reference standard

prevalence of the disease/condition

numerical results (sensitivity, specificity, likelihood ratios, etc.)

* Paragraph summarizing a practice guideline lacks:

developing organization

development process (consensus or evidence-based)

SOR or level/grade of evidence indicators

**COMMENTS:**

# Paragraph 5, if applicable

## Score:

* Paragraph summarizing a single study lacks:

research question/topic of the study

study design (RCT, cohort, etc.)

number of patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of intervention and comparator (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a systematic review or meta-analysis lacks:

research question/topic of the study

design of included studies (RCT, cohort, etc.)

total number of included studies

total number of included patients

patient demographics and/or description of included patients (diagnostic criteria, disease severity, etc.)

description of interventions and comparators (treatment protocol, dose, route, frequency, duration, etc.)

Numerical results (95% CI, P value, etc.)

If outcomes are measured via outcome scales or scoring systems, the manuscript lacks:

description of what is measured

range of possible scores and indication of which end of range equals improvement

* Paragraph summarizing a diagnostic study (or meta-analysis of the same) lacks:

description of testing protocol

description of reference standard

prevalence of the disease/condition

numerical results (sensitivity, specificity, likelihood ratios, etc.)

* Paragraph summarizing a practice guideline lacks:

developing organization

development process (consensus or evidence-based)

SOR or level/grade of evidence indicators

**COMMENTS:**

**Section 3: Tables** [**page 13**](https://fpin.memberclicks.net/assets/HDAMemberResources/WritingHDAs/HDA%20Author%20Handbook%20102819.pdf)

# Manuscript will be rejected for two (2) or more infractions in this section

## Score:

* Any tables lack: 10

stand-alone title

reference citation numbers

minimal number clutter in cells (only 1 or 2 numbers in each cell)

**COMMENTS:**