



# ARTICLE REVIEW CHECKLIST

Article title: \_\_\_\_\_

Author: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Review Checklist

Use the following scores to critique your partner's article.

Score	Description
1 = Absent	The element is absent from the article and needs to be included.
2 = Needs Revision	The element is present but needs revision.
3 = Satisfactory	The element is present and may be acceptable even though it does not completely follow the standards discussed during the workshop.
4 = Good	The element is present and consistent with the standards discussed during the workshop.
5 = Excellent	The element is present, consistent with the standards discussed during the workshop, and is of a remarkable/outstanding quality.
NA = not applicable	The element is not relevant to this article.

Category	Criteria	1-Absent	2-Revise	3-Satisfactory	4-Good	5-Excellent	NA
<b>Introduction</b>	Describes the disease/event investigated/communicated						
	States the rationale or justification for surveillance						
	If research article, the research question is clearly stated						
	Clearly lists objective(s) of article						
	Includes relevant citations that support need for study						
	Notes:						
<b>Methods</b>	Provides details of Who, Where and What						
	If research article, provides details on how study participants were selected, how many refused, and how many dropped out (include flowchart if appropriate).						
	Provides details on How the data were collected						
	Methods used for collecting data are appropriate						
	Provides details on how data were analyzed						

Category	Criteria	1-Absent	2-Revise	3-Satisfactory	4-Good	5-Excellent	NA
	Methods for analyzing data are appropriate and the analyses is correct						
	Notes:						
<b>Results</b>	Principal patterns and features are described without repeating all raw data						
	Data are summarized using appropriate tables, figures, and text						
	Tables conform to best practices. Can tables be interpreted without text?						
	Figures conform to best practices. Can figures be interpreted without text?						
	Notes:						
<b>Discussion</b>	Provides conclusions that addresses the study questions and are supported by the findings						
	Relates findings to existing literature						
	Formulates recommendations that flow logically from the findings						
	Recommendations are realistic and achievable						
	Recommendations are specific						
	Includes a limitations section						
	Notes:						
<b>Bibliographic References</b>	References are numbered and in the order of how they appear in the text and in the bibliography						
	Document includes citations where appropriate						
	References are relevant to the topic and cited accurately						
	Primary references are used when appropriate						
	References are consistent in terms of style included in the Instructions to Authors						
	Notes:						
<b>General Form and Clarity</b>	Punctuation and grammar use is correct and consistent						
	The title states who, what, where and when and accurately reflects the contents of the article						
	Uses correct and consistent spelling						
	Other people's work is credited						
	Writing is in paragraph form. Bullets are used sparingly						

Category	Criteria	1-Absent	2-Revise	3-Satisfactory	4-Good	5-Excellent	NA
	The use of abbreviations and acronyms is minimized. They are spelled out before they are used.						
	Structure follows the IMRAD format						
	Article uses plain language throughout						
	Notes:						

*Note: Review form adapted from Field Epidemiology Training Program (17 April 2018). Participant – Field Interval 1 – Guide to Field Projects (DRAFT v1), as cited in CDC Foundation Reviewer round table (May 2024).*