

## **Questions to guide the reviewer regarding decisions on TECHNICAL INNOVATION 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 the manuscript should be rejected.
2. Do the authors provide a sound rationale for writing this manuscript?  
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. (Note there may only be preliminary data in a TI manuscript.)
4. Have the concepts been clearly presented?  
If **no**, then the manuscript likely should be rejected or major revision should 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**

- Is there a clear and concise Objective statement?
- Is there a clear and concise Conclusion statement?

### **The Introduction**

- Is the Introduction concise?
- Is the purpose of the innovation clearly defined based on a review of the medical literature, i.e., do the authors provide a rationale for this Technical Innovation?
- Do the authors define terms used in the remainder of the manuscript?

## **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 parallel 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?

## **Conclusion**

- Is there a brief Conclusion appropriately summarizing the manuscript?

## **Figures and Graphs**

- Are there more than 3 figures (more than 6 images)?
- Are the figures and graphs correct and are they appropriately labeled?
- Do the figures and graphs adequately show the important concepts?
- 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**

- Are there more than 4 Tables?
- Do the tables appropriately describe the results?

## **References**

- Are there more than 8 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?