Questions to guide the reviewer regarding decisions on ORIGINAL RESEARCH MANUSCRIPTS

1. Does the manuscript provide new information that is not already available in published form?
   If yes, please provide a description of what you believe is new.
   If no, then unless the manuscript has something else extremely important to offer, the manuscript likely should be rejected.

2. Do the authors provide a sound rationale for performing this study?
   If no, then the manuscript likely should be rejected.

3. Has the data been properly analyzed?
   If no, then the manuscript likely should be rejected or major revisions should be requested.

4. Have the results been clearly presented?
   If no, then a major revision should likely be requested.

Please list major comments that need to be addressed in a revision (i.e., the manuscript cannot be accepted unless these comments are adequately addressed)

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 

Please list other comments that you request to be addressed in a revision

5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 

Other items to be considered when composing your review (please structure your review using the headings listed below)

The Abstract
- Does the Abstract appropriately summarize the manuscript?
- Do any discrepancies exist between the Abstract and the remainder of the manuscript?
- Can the abstract be understood without reading the manuscript?

The Introduction
- Is the Introduction concise?
- Is the purpose of the study clearly defined?
- Do the authors provide a rationale for performing the study based on a review of the medical literature?
- Do the authors define terms used in the remainder of the manuscript?
- Is there a well-defined hypothesis?
Methods
• Could another investigator reproduce the study using the Methods as outlined?
• Do the authors justify any choices available to them in their study design (e.g., choices of imaging techniques, analytic tools, or statistical methods)?
• Have the authors designed methods that could reasonably allow their hypothesis to be tested

Results
• Are the Results clearly explained?
• Does the order of presentation of the Results parallels the order of presentation of the Methods?
• Are the Results reasonable and expected?
• Are any Results introduced that are not preceded by an appropriate discussion in the Methods?

Discussion
• Is the Discussion concise?
• Do the authors state whether the hypothesis was verified or falsified?
• Are the author’s conclusions justified by the results found in the study?
• Do the authors adequately account for unexpected results?
• Do the authors note limitations of the study?

Figures and Graphs
• Are the figures and graphs correct and are they appropriately labeled?
• Do the figures and graphs adequately show the important results?
• Do arrows need to be added to depict important or subtle findings?
• Do the figure legends provide a clear explanation that allows the figures and graphs to be understood without making reference to the remainder of the manuscript?

Tables
• Do the tables appropriately describe the Results?

References
• Does the reference list follow the format for the journal?
• Does the reference list contain errors?
• Do any important references need to be added?