Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for MedEdPORTAL and ensuring submitted resources are accurate, clear, complete, and relevant to health professions education. The below policies and guidelines were developed to help new and experienced reviewers understand the review expectations developed by the MedEdPORTAL editorial board and staff.

Peer Review Process

All MedEdPORTAL submissions are first reviewed by editorial staff to ensure they meet submission requirements. Once the editors determine a submission is ready for peer review, they invite two reviewers based on their areas of expertise. The review, narrative feedback, and editorial recommendation, from both reviewers and an associate editor, are submitted to the editor-in-chief for consideration. The feedback from both reviewers and the associate editors are included verbatim in the decision email to the authors, whose ability to address the recommendations depends on the editorial decision. In rare occasions, reviewers may be asked to review a revised version of a submission.

Timeframe

Reviewers are asked to complete & submit their review within 3 weeks of accepting the review invitation. If you are unable to complete the review, please either decline the invitation or contact the Editorial Office as soon as possible. This allows us to reassign the submission to another reviewer and avoid delays.

Confidentiality

Authors entrust reviewers with their creative effort. As such, their reputation and career may be affected by disclosure of the confidential details of their work’s review. Because of this, reviewers are asked to keep (1) the name of the author(s) and affiliated institution(s), and (2) the title and specific nature of the material confidential while a submission is under review. Reviewers must not use knowledge of the work, before its publication, to further their own interests. 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 Editorial Office.

Masking

MedEdPORTAL employs a single-masked review process. While the identity of the author is available to the reviewer, the identities of the reviewers are not available to the author. This is to ensure an impartial review.

Conflict of Interest

Reviewers are required to declare any and all potential conflicts of interest. 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 includes, any situation where the reviewer:

- Could gain personally or financially as a result of reviewing the submission.
- Has a close collaboration or competition with one of the authors.
- Has a related product, program, or resource that would benefit as a result of reviewing the submission.
- Cannot objectively review the submission.
Completing a Review

When completing a review, all reviewers must utilize the online peer review form available through Editorial Manager: https://www.editorialmanager.com/mededportal. All comments must be submitted through the online form. Attachments cannot be included as part of the review. All completed reviews are eligible for AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™. For details review our Instructions for CME.

Evaluation Criteria

To evaluate assigned submissions, reviewers must scrutinize the presentation and quality of information contained within the materials submitted for publication (i.e., the Educational Summary Report and associated appendices). Specifically, reviewers should consider whether all submissions adhere to the six criteria for educational scholarship defined below (Glassick, et al., 1997) and are generalizable in nature (i.e., the materials can be implemented at another institution without additional effort, cost, or explanation).

- **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.
- **ADEQUATE PREPARATION:** The author uses prior work (e.g., existing scholarship and personal experience) to inform and develop the work.
- **APPROPRIATE METHODS:** The author uses a suitable approach to meet the stated educational objectives of the work.
- **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.
- **EFFECTIVE PRESENTATION:** The author effectively organizes and presents the work sufficiently clearly that others can easily emulate/use and build upon it.
- **REFLECTIVE CRITIQUE:** The author thoughtfully assesses the work and uses review/critique from other sources to refine, enhance, or expand the original concept.

Comments to the Author

The most important part of the review is the narrative feedback written by each reviewer. Reviewer feedback is used by the editor-in-chief to make final publication decisions and is sent to authors so that they might further enhance and refine their work.

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

- A brief resource summary with an indication of how the submission contributes to the field.
- Identification of strengths and weaknesses with specific recommended revisions.
- A strong case for the selected editorial recommendation, which the editors can support and build on.

Reviewers have the option to make brief confidential comments for the editor. The author will not read these comments.

Issuing a Recommendation

All reviewers are required to issue a single, final recommendation of Accept with No Revisions, Revisions Required, or Reject, based on an overall assessment of the material according to its relative strengths and weaknesses.