

Guidelines for reviewing manuscripts for the journal Sestrinski glasnik/Nursing Journal

I. Unpublished manuscripts are the property of the authors. The information contained therein must not be used or shared. If you show this manuscript to anyone while preparing your review, please state who and why in your Confidential Comments for the Editors. Destroy the manuscript after reviewing.

II. In the Confidential Comments to Editors ONLY, indicate whether the manuscript should be accepted, rejected, or potentially accepted after revisions are made. Be as specific as possible in your Confidential Comments to the Editors, and include the rationale for your recommendation. Please indicate if any part of the paper should be elucidated in an editorial; the Editors would appreciate your suggestions of potential editorial writers (including yourself).

III. In the Comments to Authors, write specific constructive criticisms which, if followed, would improve the manuscript to your satisfaction. Please number your comments to the authors in order to facilitate their response. *Do not give any indication of your recommendation regarding acceptance in the Comments to Authors.** However, if you are not in favour of acceptance, be sure to tell the authors your specific objections. Do comment on all of the following (if applicable):

Ad 1] Originality/novelty/importance: Does this observation address an important question that has not already been answered from the literature? Would this be an important addition to the literature?

Ad 2] Are there any ethical issues regarding conflict of interest, informed consent, IRB approval, possible duplicate publication, etc.? As required by The Journal, authors must upload in-press submissions and/or prior publications that have overlapping information with the submitted manuscript. Additional manuscripts and/or published articles are included after the current manuscript in the PDF. Please feel free to include comments regarding overlap in your review.

Ad 3] Is this a randomized controlled trial? If so, are the following elements included: (1) clinical trials registry and identification number; and the (2) CONSORT flowchart?

Ad 4] Text presentation

1. Abstract:

Does the Abstract accurately reflect the contents of the manuscript?

2. Introduction:

Does it state the problem and study objectives clearly and adequately?

Does it review the background adequately, yet succinctly?

3. Methods:

Were the methods suitable? Is the design sufficient to answer the question?

Does the section contain enough detail? Too much?

Is the study group described adequately?

Are the equipment and techniques described adequately?

4. Results:

Are the data sufficient to answer the question? Is there enough detail? Too much

Do all data presented relate to the main point?

Is the statistical analysis adequate?

5. Discussion:

Is the section too long? Is there material that does not relate to the main point or overlaps with another section?

Is previous work in the field reviewed adequately and fairly?

Do all conclusions proceed logically from the statistical results? Have the data been interpreted accurately and objectively?

Do the conclusions answer the aims of the study?

Are the limitations of the study discussed adequately?

6. Tables and Figures:

Are there enough illustrations? Too many? Is there overlap with text?

Are labels clear? Are important features visible and well marked?

Are legends understandable?

Is the quality of the figures adequate for publication?

7. References:

Are there more than necessary? Do all references relate to the question? Could individual studies be cited instead from review articles?

Do they cover the current state of the art fairly? Are any important references omitted?

Are there misquotes or misinterpretations of references?

Please categorize the manuscript [examples: Original scientific paper; Review Paper; Professional paper; Case report; Brief communication].