MedEdPORTAL® Publications
Reviewer Expectations

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for MedEdPORTAL Publications. The below guidelines were developed to help new and experienced reviewers understand the review expectations developed by the MedEdPORTAL editorial board and staff.

We ask that reviewers examine the Educational Summary Report and each of the resource files carefully and thoroughly. All of the files associated with the submission can be found by clicking green “Original Files” button from any of the three tabs.

In addition to the questions on the Peer Review Form, we ask that all reviewers provide narrative feedback. This is the most important part of the review process. At a minimum, please provide the following narrative feedback for the author:

a. Briefly summarize the nature of the submission (typically 2-3 sentences).

b. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses* (typically 2 or more paragraphs).
   • List specific revisions you would require the author to make*
   • Explain any “NO” responses to the review form questions

c. Summarize comments and rationale for publication decision (typically 1 or more paragraphs).

*Be sure to reference specifics whenever possible.

Timeframe
Reviewers are asked to complete their review and submit an editorial decision recommendation within three weeks of their submission assignment.

If you are unable to complete the review, please contact the Editorial Office as soon as possible. This allows us to reassign the submission to another reviewer and avoid delays in the review of that submission.

Confidentiality
MedEdPORTAL Publications employs a “single-blinded” review process—while the author’s name is disclosed to the reviewers, the reviewers are unknown to the author. It is expected that reviewers keep all information pertaining the submission confidential, both during the review and afterwards. If you wish to involve a specially qualified colleague in the review (or guide a junior colleague in learning how to review), please inform the MedEdPORTAL Publications Editorial Office.

Conflict of Interest
Reviewers must disclose to the Editor whether any conflicts of interest exist that could bias their opinion. Simply knowing one of the authors or having casual knowledge of the submitted resource does not necessarily mean a conflict of interest exists.

Examples of where conflict of interest does exist include:

• Any situation where the reviewer could gain personally or financially as a result of reviewing the submission.

• A close collaboration or competition with one of the authors.

• Review of the submission would benefit a particular product, program or resource related to the reviewer.

• Any situation that could limit an objective review of any submission.

Please direct any questions to mededportal@aamc.org.