



CHECKLIST (GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS) **FARMACIA HOSPITALARIA**

REVIEWER IDENTIFICATION

Reviewer name

Manuscript: (Abbreviated title).....

Paper code:

Conflicts of interest

.....

Date.....

FINAL RECOMMENDATION	
	PUBLISHABLE The manuscript may be accepted
	RE-EVALUATE The authors should be asked to make corrections
	NON-PUBLISHABLE The article should be rejected

ADAPTATION TO GUIDELINES

Please indicate the article type that you propose for this paper if it is published:

- Original Short original Review
 Special article Letter to the editor Editorial
 Clinical Cases

- Originals, short originals, and reviews:
 1. **Body of the article:** introduction, method, results, discussion
 2. **Abstract:** objectives, method, results, conclusions
- Letters to the editor: free text.
- Clinical cases: introduction, case description, discussion

Depending on the article type, it may not be necessary to evaluate all included items.

TITLE	YES	NO	Not applicable
It must adequately describe the content of the paper and the design in a single phrase (in general, no more than 15 words). Acronyms, codes, and symbols that are not commonly used should be avoided.			
1. Does it have 15 or fewer words?			
2. Is it written in a single phrase that is not broken up by punctuation?			
3. Is it written in a positive tone?			
4. Is the type of study design mentioned in the title?			
5. Does it contain main descriptors that allow for visibility?			
6. Is the title adapted to the content of the article?			
If it should be changed, your proposal is:			

ABSTRACT	YES	NO	Not applicable
Should be structured by: objective, method, results and conclusions. Should be characterised by: 1) can act as a substitute for the text if the text is not available; 2) describes the same essential objectives and results as the manuscript; 3) does not include data not mentioned in the text; 4) avoid abbreviations.			
7. Do the objective and conclusions coincide with those in the body of the paper?			
8. In the methods section, are the population, setting design, and main variables specified?			
9. Is there coherence among the objectives, results and conclusions?			
10. Are there any acronyms or abbreviations?			

KEY WORDS	YES	NO	Not applicable
The submission must include five to eight key words that identify the content of the paper for inclusion in indexes and databases. If possible, they should match the terms in the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) proposed by the <i>U.S. National Library of Medicine</i> , available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh .			
11. Do the authors present 5 to 8 words that are closely related to the subject of the paper and MeSH (Medical Subject Headings) descriptors?			

INTRODUCTION	YES	NO	Not applicable
In 3 or 4 paragraphs, the introduction should present the subject of the study, highlight what is known about the subject to date, describe the absence of knowledge that justifies the study and, in the last paragraph, set forth the study objectives. The introduction must cite relevant references justifying the purposes of the study.			
1. Does the introduction specify the interest and background of the problem to be investigated?			
2. Do the objectives respond to the interest of the research project?			
3. Are the objectives precise, measurable, relevant and novel?			
4. Are the objectives defined at the end of the introduction?			
5. Are the objectives defined clearly in the infinitive tense?			
6. Is the introduction written in the present tense?			

METHOD		YES	NO	Not applicable
<p>This section seeks for the study to be reproducible by another researcher. It must describe precisely and in order: the study design, the setting (time and place), the population and the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the sample size, the techniques, the variables used, the statistical analysis, and the ethical considerations.</p> <p>Reviews must describe the bibliographic search that was performed and the inclusion and exclusion criteria for papers.</p>				
DESIGN				
1.	Is the design type indicated?			
2.	Is the design suited to the objective?			
3.	Are the proposed interventions, processes and/or techniques explained clearly? Is it reproducible?			
4.	Are the setting and duration described?			
POPULATION				
5.	Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria described adequately?			
6.	Does the paper describe why the study focuses on a specific population?			
7.	Does the paper describe the determination of the sample size?			
8.	Does it describe the assignment and masking method?			
VARIABLES				
9.	Are the variables suited to the objectives?			
10.	Are the sources of information clearly identified?			
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS				
11.	Is the statistical analysis described and is it appropriate?			
12.	Does the paper describe expected drop-outs, extreme values, and how they were treated?			
13.	Are possible confounding variables described?			
14.	Does the paper indicate the statistical program that was used?			
GENERAL ASPECTS				
15.	Are ethical principles respected?			
16.	Is it written in the past tense?			

RESULTS		YES	NO	Not applicable
<p>In approximately 6 paragraphs, this section should describe, in a coherent and orderly way, the findings obtained for the study objectives, detailing both positive and negative findings. The information to be presented should be appropriately selected, with an emphasis on important observations and avoiding given of superfluous or unnecessary information. The data may be mentioned either in the text or in tables or figures, without repetition.</p>				
1.	Are the results (primary and secondary) presented in an objective, descriptive and orderly way?			
2.	Are results presented for all measured variables?			
3.	Do the results respond to the established objectives?			
4.	Are the data presented appropriately:			
	Value of the estimator			
	Estimation of precision (standard error, confidence interval)			
	Significance			
	Statistical test?			
5.	Are the tables and figures necessary and/or sufficient?			
	Is there a table or text describing the population?			
	Are the tables and figures self-explanatory and suited to the results?			

6. Is duplication of data avoided in figures, tables and/or text?			
7. Is the past tense used?			
DISCUSSION The discussion must rigorously interpret the results and highlight novel and relevant aspects of the study and its strengths in 4 sections (8-10 paragraphs): 1) highlight the results of the research project that respond to the study's primary objective; 2) evaluate the results in comparison with other studies 3) discuss the limitations of the work and possible repercussions on the interpretation of the results; and 4) The practical implications of the results and their significance Finally, it must explain the study conclusions, which should respond to the established objectives.	YES	NO	Not applicable
1. Does this section discuss results that respond to the primary objective?			
2. Are the results themselves compared to other data available in the references?			
3. Are the results interpreted correctly in terms of their significance?			
4. Does this section include comments that do not come from the study?			
5. Does it highlight relevant novel aspects of the study, as well as its strengths?			
6. Does it describe the limitations, inconsistencies in methodology, and anomalous or unexpected results?			
7. Does it discuss practical application of the results?			
8. Does it suggest new proposals for research?			
9. Do the final conclusions respond to the study objectives and are they based on the results that were obtained?			
10. Does it use the present tense for results cited from other researchers and the past tense for results obtained in this study?			

REFERENCES	YES	NO	Not applicable
1. Are references distributed correctly between the introduction and the discussion? • Approximately 60% in the introduction (recommended)			
2. Is it updated? Suggested: • 60-70% less than 5 years ago, • 15-25% from 5-10 years ago, • less than 10% more than 10 years ago			
3. Do all citations comply with Vancouver Style and are they written correctly?			
4. Do the references preferably come from "Original articles"?			
5. Are the key words found in the titles of the references?			
6. Does the reviewer know of any relevant citation that is not included? Please cite it:			

FINAL GENERAL EVALUATION	YES	NO	Not
---------------------------------	------------	-----------	------------

			applicable
Originality of the paper and contribution to scientific literature			
The article falls within the scope of the journal			
Appropriate writing style			