

Important information for reviewers of AFP articles

- The manuscript is confidential. Do not discuss it with anyone other than the editors of *Australian Family Physician*. Once you have completed the review, please either return the manuscript to the editorial office or dispose of it carefully. The manuscript is the original work of the authors and, as such, photocopying (or any other form of reproduction) of this work is prohibited until publication, after which time permission to reproduce must be requested from the publisher, The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (RACGP).
- Your review will be given (anonymously) to the authors. This can be very helpful to authors, even if the manuscript is rejected. Your review should focus on what can be done to improve the manuscript, even if it is already of a high quality. Please indicate where comments are 'confidential to editor'.
- Your advice is advice. The editors of *AFP* make final decisions on publication.
- There is no need to comment on style, punctuation, grammar and other mechanical aspects of the document. The editors of *AFP* will attend to these matters later in the production process should the manuscript be found acceptable for publication.
- Please advise the editors of *AFP* if you believe you have a conflict of interest in reviewing the manuscript.
- **Length?** Can the manuscript be shortened without detracting from important points? Can any tables/figures, parts of the introduction or discussion be deleted, combined, or improved?
- **Suggestions and other articles**
In some cases, a manuscript may be appropriately accompanied by an editorial or CME (continuing medical education) questions. Please let us know if you think this is the case and please offer your suggestions.
- **Other reviews**
If you feel you are unable to appropriately comment on a section of the manuscript and that section requires specialist or other review, please indicate the specific area of concern.
- **Recommendation**
Do you think the manuscript should be published in *Australian Family Physician*? Why/why not?

Guidelines for reviewing manuscripts

(NB: please see separate instructions for reviews of research manuscripts)

- **Importance** Is this manuscript important to general practice clinicians, patients, educators or policy makers?
- **Originality** What (if anything) does this manuscript add to the literature? If you know of material not cited, please cite it.
- **Science/evidence** Is this manuscript correctly designed if research, or based on appropriately sourced, quality assessed evidence if a review? Are enough details provided of the methods or source of evidence?
- **Interpretation** Are conclusions, take home messages properly based on the data/evidence offered?

Important information for reviewers of AFP research articles

- The manuscript is confidential. Do not discuss it with anyone other than the editors of *Australian Family Physician*. Once you have completed the review, please either return the manuscript to the editorial office or dispose of it carefully. The manuscript is the original work of the authors and, as such, photocopying (or any other form of reproduction) of this work is prohibited until publication, after which time permission to reproduce must be requested from the publisher, The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (RACGP).
 - Your review will be given (anonymously) to the authors. This can be very helpful to authors, even if the manuscript is rejected. Your review should focus on what can be done to improve the manuscript, even if it is already of a high quality. Please indicate where comments are 'confidential to editor'.
 - Your advice is advice. The editors of *AFP* make final decisions on publication.
 - There is no need to comment on style, punctuation, grammar and other mechanical aspects of the document. The editors of *AFP* will attend to these matters later in the production process should the manuscript be found acceptable for publication.
 - Please advise the editors of *AFP* if you believe you have a conflict of interest in reviewing the manuscript.
- ## Guidelines for reviewing – research articles
- **Importance** Is this manuscript important to general practice clinicians, patients, educators or policy makers?
 - **Originality** What (if anything) does this manuscript add to the literature? If you know of material not cited, please cite it.
 - **Science/evidence**
 - Research objectives: Are they clearly stated? Are they met?
 - Study design and methodology: Is it appropriate to the objectives? Has it been completed correctly? Are there any flaws in the methodology?
 - Results: Is the data sound? Is the data all accounted for? Is there rigour in the collection and analysis of the data?
 - Interpretation: Are conclusions, take home messages properly based on the data/evidence offered? Have alternatives been explored?
 - Existing literature: Has the existing literature been considered appropriately?
 - Abstract: Does the abstract reflect the content/findings of the manuscript?
 - Reporting standards: Does this manuscript meet any relevant reporting standards for the type of research?
 - **Presentation** Is the manuscript presented in a clear and logical way? If not, can it be improved? How?
 - **Length** Can the manuscript be shortened without detracting from important points? Can any tables/figures, parts of the introduction or discussion be deleted, combined, or improved?
 - **Suggestions and other articles** In some cases, a manuscript may be appropriately accompanied by an editorial. Please let us know if you think this is the case and please offer your suggestions.
 - **Other reviews** If you feel you are unable to appropriately comment on a section of the manuscript and that section requires specialist/statistical/other review, please indicate the specific area of concern.
 - **Recommendation** Do you think the manuscript should be published in *Australian Family Physician*? Why/ why not?