



# General medicine

## Journal of the Section of General medicine, Serbian Medical Society

Address: Džordž Vašington st. 19, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia

Phone: +381 66 5598422; +381 11 3234 450

Fax: + 381 11 3246 090

Email: [ompm@sld.org.rs](mailto:ompm@sld.org.rs)

---

## Reviewer form

Title:

### Reviewer`s comments

<b>1. Importance and suitability of the manuscript</b>	<b>Points 1 - 5</b>
<p><b>Is the subject suitable for publication in the journal?</b></p> <p><i>Articles concerning different areas of medicine (i.e. space medicine) or different approach technics to certain diseases (i.e. pancreatic cancer) may be published in the journal, but they will get lower scores (i.e. scores range from 1-5, the article will score 1). Articles concerning current themes and problems of general/family medicine will get the highest score (i.e. 5). The score depends on the article`s importance for the journal which is intended for general medicine/family medicine doctors.</i></p>	
<p><b>Is the topic important for the intended reader?</b></p> <p><i>The intended reader is the physician working in the field of general/family medicine. If the topic covers the areas of interest for primary care physicians, the article will get higher scores. For example, the article about sexual problems may be of interest to PCPs (primary care physicians) and it will get higher scores. The article on new guidelines for hypertension or diabetes treatment will get the highest scores.</i></p>	
<b>2. Manuscript content</b>	
<p><b>Manuscript`s importance score</b></p> <p><i>How important and applicable is the article in the everyday work of GP/FM</i></p>	

<p><i>physician? Surgical techniques are of little importance for our journal and the articles of the sort will score lower. On the other hand, the article on the most common mistakes in everyday work on the primary care level will get the highest scores.</i></p>	
<p><b>Manuscript`s level of originality</b></p> <p><i>Is it a new approach to an important problem in PCP`s everyday practice? For example, an article on diabetes in PCP`s practice is not much of a novelty and it will get a lower score, but the use of new guidelines through PCP`s practice will score higher.</i></p>	
<p><b>Manuscript`s comprehensiveness</b></p> <p><i>How comprehensive is the article? Does it address the topic in full or just a small part? Score low or high, accordingly.</i></p>	
<p><b>Topic coverage in relation to the manuscript`s volume</b></p> <p><i>Is the manuscript over extensive, appropriate or insufficient in relation to the topic? The article may be over extensive but containing just a few piecies of information concerning the main topic.</i></p>	
<p><b>Is the methodology appropriate and according to the manuscript`s volume</b></p> <p><i>This is one of the major problems for many manuscripts. The methodology must be clear and precise. The author must clearly explain how he/she performed the research, name the data source, number of the study participants, study time frame, how were the data acquired, was there a control group, was the statistical analysis performed, what statistical program was used? It`s very important to use a methodology that will enable reaching the set goals.</i></p>	
<p><b>Does the conclusion ensue from the data?</b></p> <p><i>The conclusion should give answers that ensue from the results which are the reflection of the set goals. If there are no such answers, the conclusion doesn`t ensue from the data. This may be more or less pronounced and the score will depend on it.</i></p>	
<p><b>References</b></p> <p><i>Up to date – outdated, complete – incomplete; quotation of the domestic authors` significant research? In general, literature shouldn`t be older than five years, on average and it should be correctly cited; 80% of the cited literature should be less than five years old, except for the articles from the history of medicine. Books quotations should be avoided, Wikipedia and such. They are not easily available for the reviewer to find and check through KoBSON or Google. In case the literature on the topic is scarce, books may be used, but they should be available to check on the internet. For example, the author writes on hypertension and hypertensive crisis and fails to mention the latest European guidelines on the subject. It`s considered an oversight and the reviewer should recommend them as the compulsory literature to the author. Very often, there`s no literature in the native language. If there is some significant domestic research on the subject, it should be recommended to the authors to include in their work. Pay attention that all the cited literature is mentioned in the article and indexed in the correct order. The number of references should be neither too big, nor too small (3-4</i></p>	

<p>references). An optimal number of references is considered 15-20. Take into account if the author cited significant references and avoided insignificant ones. If not, bring that to his/her attention. Check if the cited literature really exists and is cited well.</p>	
<p><b>3. Manuscript report</b></p>	
<p><b>Text</b></p> <p><i>Understandable – clear, concise. Are there any dilemmas? Is the text understandable, sentences clear? Are there any dilemmas as to what the author was going to say or explain? Does the author go to great lengths to explain the obvious things?</i></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p> <p><i>Is it distinctive and does it relate to the article`s content? The title should reflect the essence of the article. Very often the title correlates to the article but doesn`t really describe it in the best way. The reviewer may suggest a more appropriate title.</i></p>	
<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p><i>Does it point to the aim? What has been done? What has been found? The importance? The abstract should contain all the key components of the manuscript: the essence of the methodology and all the important data from the results. Does the abstract contain all it should or is something missing or maybe redundant? Is the word count according to the Instructions for authors.</i></p>	
<p><b>Pictures – tables – figures</b></p> <p><i>Are they complete, readable, indexed in the text? What`s the quality of the drawings? Is there a key with graphs (Serbian and English, bilingual)? Are the tables and figures according to the Instructions for authors? Is everything clear and well organized? Is there a short explanation with every picture, table, figure, if necessary? Does the figure contain numerical values? Does the discussion contain the references to tables and figures? Are the citations documented with tables and figures? Is the key appropriate and clear?</i></p>	
<p><b>Tables</b></p> <p><i>Are the tables neat, instructions followed? Could they be simplified or shortened? Does the reviewer think tables and figures should be clearer, shortened, simplified? Tables shouldn`t be ornate, overbearing and thus draw away the attention from the essence of the manuscript. Check the data in the tables (do they add up, percentages, etc).</i></p>	
<p><b>Are the symbols, terms, and concepts appropriately and well defined and explained?</b></p> <p><i>Are the terms well explained in reference to literature? For example, the hypertensive crisis should be explained using new European or American or some other relevant society`s hypertensive guidelines. Are the abbreviations explained in the text? Also, explain frequently used abbreviations (i.e. CT – computerized tomography). Are the discussed or mentioned concepts explained and where they originate from? (usually found in the references and indexed in the text)</i></p>	

<p><b>Keywords</b></p> <p><i>They are right or not, according to MeSH – Medical Subject Heading. There are too few or too many of them. Do the keywords point clearly to the subject, area, essence of the manuscript? Usually, the words appearing in the title do not appear in the keywords, although research may include keywords in the titles, abstracts, keywords themselves. We translated keywords from The Research plan in general/family medicine, written by EGPRN, and they will be available to all reviewers on demand. If keywords are inadequate, the reviewer may suggest the ones he/she finds more appropriate.</i></p>	
<p><b>4. The form – following the instructions</b></p>	
<p><i>Are the literary rules being followed? (i.e. over 5000 words, or the parts of the manuscript are inadequate – too large abstract, scarce results and discussion); Does the manuscript conform to the Instructions for authors? Does it contain all the necessary parts? If there are huge oversights in the manuscript's organization and mostly doesn't conform to the Instruction for authors, the reviewer is entitled to return the manuscript to the author to make the necessary changes.</i></p>	
<p><b>Statistics</b></p> <p><i>These data are provided by the statistician, but the reviewer's opinion is recommended as well (Did the author do the statistical analysis, as mentioned in the methodology? Is an appropriate statistical method used? Were there any comments on the results of the statistical analysis and how did they fit with the aims, discussion? Are the results shown uniformly i.e. <math>p &lt;</math> or <math>p =</math>, etc)</i></p>	
<p><b>5. Manuscript's relative value compared to the others from the same group</b></p>	
<p><i>Are there similar manuscripts in Serbian or foreign language? If there are no manuscripts on the subject, in Serbian, the manuscript should be scored higher; but if there are, even in the foreign language, the manuscript may score lower.</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Review</b></p>	
<p><i>The review is not graded because we have reviewers for the Serbian and English language. The reviewer may point to the author the sentences are not clear and there are dilemmas about the meaning. There may be grammar or letter mistakes, incorrect word spaces, paragraphs, headings. The parts of the manuscript are not singled out – Introduction, Aim, Method, etc. The reviewer shouldn't correct grammar and misspelling.</i></p>	
<p><b>Total score</b></p>	

## **Reviewer`s recommendation**

**Accept the manuscript: YES or NO**

1. No changes
2. Suggested changes are not compulsory
3. Compulsory changes and additions

**Publish in the column:**

- Original paper
- Review paper
- Statements
- Case reports
- History of medicine

**Date**

**Reviewer**