## Peer Review Form v 4.0: Revised September 2017

MedEdPORTAL reviewers use the online peer review management system to complete assigned reviews. Reviewers answer the following standardized peer review questions to rate each item in terms of content quality, presentation, effectiveness, and significance.

Please take a moment to review the Reviewer Expectations in the Instructions & Forms tab.

All MedEdPORTAL submissions (i.e., Educational Summary Report and associated appendices) should be evaluated based upon the six criteria of educational scholarship defined below (Glassick, et al., 1997). Please indicate whether the author has met each criterion and if they have not, provide your recommendations for how they might meet the criterion in the ‘Feedback to the Author’ field.

### Evaluation of Educational Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Educational Scholarship</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. CLEAR GOALS – The author explicitly states the educational objectives of the work from the perspective of the target audience; the objectives are SMART: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, and Realistic. | □ Yes  
□ No  
□ Not Sure |
| 2. ADEQUATE PREPARATION – The author uses prior work (e.g. existing scholarship and personal experience) to inform and develop the work. | □ Yes  
□ No  
□ Not Sure |
| 3. APPROPRIATE METHODS – The author uses a suitable approach to meet the stated educational objectives of the work. | □ Yes  
□ No  
□ Not Sure |
| 4. SIGNIFICANT RESULTS – The author achieves the goals and contributes substantially to others (e.g., learners, colleagues) and to the field in a manner that invites others to use the work. | □ Yes  
□ No  
□ Not Sure |
| 5. EFFECTIVE PRESENTATION – The author effectively organizes and presents the work sufficiently clear that others can easily emulate/use and build upon it. | □ Yes  
□ No  
□ Not Sure |
| 6. REFLECTIVE CRITIQUE - The author thoughtfully assesses the work and uses review/critique from other sources to refine, enhance, or expand the original concept. | □ Yes  
□ No  
□ Not Sure |
### Recommendation & Narrative Feedback

Reflecting upon the above criteria, please indicate your publication recommendation.

Then, in the Feedback to the Author field, and provide constructive feedback that supports the recommendation. The most helpful MedEdPORTAL reviews are typically three or more paragraphs in length and include the following:

- A brief resource summary with an indication of how the submission contributes to the field.
- Identification of strengths and weaknesses with specific recommended revisions.
- A strong case for the selected editorial recommendation, which the editors can support and build on.

Please be very specific with your recommendations for helping improve the work to meet the criteria for publication. Remember: the author will read these comments.

Last, Confidential Comments for the Editor should include clarifications on the author feedback. The author will not read these comments.

### Recommendation

- Accept with no Revisions
- Revisions Required
- Reject

### Comments

**Feedback for the Author**

**Confidential Comments to the Editor**

**Would you be willing to review a revision of this submission?**

- Yes
- No