**Peer Review Form v3.0**

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.

**IMPORTANT:** All MedEdPORTAL submissions 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 in the ‘Feedback to the Author’ field. Please take a moment to review our expectations for reviewers as described on the MedEdPORTAL Reviewer Resource Hub.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Educational Scholarship</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ADEQUATE PREPARATION – The author uses prior work (e.g. existing scholarship and personal experience) to inform and develop the work.</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. APPROPRIATE METHODS – The author uses a suitable approach to meet the stated educational objectives of the work.</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EFFECTIVE PRESENTATION – The author effectively organizes and presents the work sufficiently clear that others can easily emulate/use and build upon it.</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. REFLECTIVE CRITIQUE - The author thoughtfully assesses the work and uses review/critique from other sources to refine, enhance, or expand the original concept.</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendation & Narrative Feedback

Reflecting upon the above criteria, please clearly indicate your publication recommendation and provide constructive feedback that provides supporting evidence for that recommendation. This feedback should include significant strengths or weaknesses and, as appropriate, any recommended revisions. Please be very specific as your recommendations should help the author improve the work to meet the criteria for publication. Remember: the author will read these comments.

Confidential comments for the Editor should be placed into the indicated field. The author will not read these comments.

The most helpful MedEdPORTAL reviews are typically 3 or more paragraphs in length and include the following:

- A brief resource summary.
- Identification of strengths and weaknesses with specific recommended revisions.
- Your rationale for any “No” or “Not Sure” responses in the questions above and suggestions for improvement.

### Recommendation

- Accept with no Revisions
- Revisions Required
- Reject

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

- Yes
- No

### Comments

**Confidential Comments to the Editor**

**Feedback for the Author**