

asrt Literature Review Manuscript Checklist

Literature reviews assess current knowledge of a particular topic using secondary sources. Although new conclusions can be made, this type should not report new or original experimental work.

Statements answered with a “No” should include detailed comments to the author. Checklist is not returned to the author and is for the chairman’s eyes only.

| Literature Review Rating Questions | YES | NO | NA |
|--|-----|----|----|
| Topic: | | | |
| Topic is appropriate for the scope of the Journal | | | |
| Manuscript validates the body of knowledge | | | |
| Manuscript adds to the body of knowledge | | | |
| Manuscript builds on prior research | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Title: | | | |
| The title clearly states the purpose of the article | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Abstract: | | | |
| The abstract concisely summarizes the literature review | | | |
| The abstract contains a summary of the study’s purpose, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Introduction: | | | |
| The introduction clearly describes the purpose of the manuscript | | | |
| The introduction states the problem or need | | | |
| The introduction presents relevance to practice | | | |
| The introduction presents relevant background material | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Review of Literature: | | | |
| The review presents research question(s) | | | |
| The review incorporates previously published work to address key points of the manuscript | | | |
| The review provides an historical perspective of the topic | | | |
| The review includes key aspects of the topic | | | |
| The review provides definitions | | | |
| The review states assumptions | | | |

| Literature Review Rating Questions | YES | NO | NA |
|--|-----|----|----|
| Comments: | | | |
| Method: | | | |
| Discusses literature search strategies including databases used and MeSH terms | | | |
| Includes rationale for inclusion and exclusion criteria | | | |
| Includes level of detail required to replicate study | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Discussion/Conclusion: | | | |
| The discussion incorporates previously published work to support conclusions | | | |
| The discussion presents content strengths and limitations in an unbiased manner | | | |
| The discussion provides a thorough analysis of the literature | | | |
| The discussion addresses implications of the results for evidence-based practice | | | |
| The conclusions are supported by information presented in the manuscript | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Figures and Tables: | | | |
| Includes figures and tables of sufficient quality | | | |
| Includes a sufficient number of figures and illustrations | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Style: | | | |
| Manuscript is organized and has logical flow | | | |
| Manuscript uses appropriate and current terminology | | | |
| Manuscript uses appropriate headings | | | |
| Manuscript is free of redundancy | | | |
| Follows AMA writing guidelines | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| References: | | | |
| References are timely or historically significant | | | |
| References appropriately support the material presented | | | |
| References are sufficient | | | |
| References are correctly cited in the text and reference list | | | |
| Comments: | | | |

Overall Comments to Author: Copy and paste this information into the “Comments to Author” field within the eJournal Press online system. This checklist does not go to the author, so the comments captured in this document are only to help the reviewer while he or she completes the review.