

# Medical Teacher Guidelines for Reviewers

## General information

*Medical Teacher*, published eight times a year, is a journal designed for the practising medical and healthcare professions teacher. It is read in over 70 countries throughout the world not just by teachers but by students, administrators and researchers. In addition to a number of regular features, the journal publishes a wide range of articles which fall into various categories: research papers, reviews, case studies, reports of innovations and 'how to do it' papers. *Medical Teacher* publishes papers relating to the continuum of education, from basic/undergraduate education through postgraduate/specialist training to continuing professional development.

Articles should normally be between 2000-4000 words, and short communications not more than 1700 words. All papers submitted must have an abstract of up to 200 words. The referencing system used is Harvard-APA (names and dates in text, alphabetical list at end of paper).

## Editorial policy

The Board makes decisions based on the recommendations of two or three reviewers. Further opinion may be sought if reviews are inconclusive, or if additional input is required (eg statistical analysis). Very few articles are accepted without any revisions. Reviewers who recommend revisions may ask to see the revised paper when resubmitted if they wish. All reviews transmitted to authors are anonymous unless the reviewer specifically asks for his/her identity to be disclosed.

## Format of the review

There is no standard proforma to be completed, and reviewers are asked to submit a review in two parts:

Part 1: For use by the Editorial Office and not for transmission to the author(s). The comments should be such that they enable the Editorial Office to make an informed decision. A recommendation as to the outcome of the paper should be given.

Part 2: For transmission to the author(s). This part should be self-contained, and should include constructive feedback on how the paper could be improved, if appropriate.

Reviewers are asked to take the following points into account:

### **Appropriateness of the topic and contribution to the literature:**

Please comment on whether the article likely to be of interest to readers of *Medical Teacher*, and whether it identifies issues of topical interest. Does the paper advance understanding of the topic, and does it contribute new knowledge to what is already known?

### **Style and content of paper:**

Is the paper well-written, logically structured and with a minimum of grammatical errors? Is the summary appropriately constructed and does it reflect the content of the article including methods used (if appropriate), results and conclusions? Is the length appropriate for the type of article? Is the literature covered adequately, are the references in the correct format for the journal? If figures and tables are presented, are these clear and logical, with figures well drawn?

**In addition, if the article under review is a research paper:**

Is the design of the study appropriate with the methods adequately explained? Are the conclusions drawn supported by the results?

**Recommendations:**

Which option do you recommend?

- Accept without revision?
- Minor revisions then accept (please indicate revisions needed)
- Major revisions required before further consideration (please indicate revisions needed)
- Reject

If you recommend publication either with or without minor revisions, please indicate the priority you would allocate to its publication, based on topicality, quality and appropriateness for *Medical Teacher*: very high; high; medium; low.