

EHP Publishing Reviewer Guidelines

From EHP Publishing's Peer Reviewer Resource Center
ehp.niehs.nih.gov/reviewers/resources



Reviewer Checklist

The following checklist is provided to reviewers for your convenience and does not need to be submitted with your review. The items on this checklist parallel the more detailed guidance provided to reviewers in the Reviewer Guidelines document.

Evaluating the Manuscript

The following guidelines parallel EHP Publishing's [author guidelines for research articles](#).

Initial Considerations

EHP Publishing publishes novel, high-quality content that significantly advances the field of human environmental health sciences.

- The manuscript is clear and written in sufficient detail to fully evaluate the work.
- The research question or objectives of the study are novel, or the findings significantly advance the field of human environmental health sciences.

Introduction

The Introduction should provide background information to support the motivation for the study and state the study objectives or hypotheses.

- The introduction includes an accurate, unbiased, and complete background that supports the authors' hypotheses.
- Authors have presented clear and accurate statements regarding knowledge gap(s) and why the current study was needed, including how the current findings may bridge the gap.
- Objectives, aims, questions, and/or hypotheses are clearly stated.

Methods

The methods should be fully described and appropriate for achieving the objectives defined in the Introduction. EHP Publishing strongly suggests that the [STROBE](#) or [ARRIVE](#) guidelines be followed for reporting epidemiological or experimental studies.

- The descriptions of methods in the main text provide enough detail for the study to be replicated or the data analyses reproduced, at least in theory.
- If another publication is cited to describe a method, a brief description of the method accompanies the citation, and the full details are provided in the cited manuscript.
- The chosen scientific methods and statistical analyses are appropriate for addressing the objectives of the study.

Results

The Results section should report all findings on which study conclusions or inferences are based (in whole or in part).

- Null findings and results of secondary or sensitivity analyses are included in the manuscript.

- All results of experiments described in the Methods are reported in either the main text or Supplemental Material. EHP Publishing does not allow “data not shown.”
- Tables and figures are sufficiently detailed to allow interpretation.
- Tables and figures are organized appropriately, including placement in main text versus Supplemental Material.
- Data and interpretations reported in the text are consistent with data presented in the tables and figures.

Discussion

The Discussion should provide a brief overview of the study findings and discuss their implications for the study objectives or hypotheses, concordance or disagreement with existing literature, and future research, as appropriate.

- A clear, succinct statement of the major findings relevant to the study objectives is present.
- Strengths and limitations of the study are fully acknowledged.
- Conclusions and inferences are consistent with the reported results and the assumptions and limitations of the research.
- The importance of the results and implications for research, public health practice, and policy are not overstated.

Supplemental Material

See EHP Publishing's [guidance on Supplemental Material](#) for information on what should be presented in Supplemental Material. If present,

- Supplemental Material meets the same rigorous standards as the main text.
- Supplemental Material is limited to details that are not required to understand the methods or interpret the main findings presented in the Results section.
- Primary methods or findings are not provided in the Supplemental Material.

General

As you perform your review, consider how the manuscript is presented and cited. Verify that:

- The presentation is clear.
- The authors refrain from causal language when causality is not supported.
- Previously published studies are appropriately described and cited.