

Instructions for reviewers

Dear reviewer:

Firstly, we would like to thank you for your collaboration with our journal. We remind you that the deadline for completing the requested review is 15 calendar days, but if necessary, you may request an extension of 7 calendar days.

To review the scope of the Archivos de Medicina (Manizales) journal, the types of articles published, and additional information, please consult the [instructions for authors](#).

The review process

Our acceptance process begins with the review of the article using the Turnitin programme to rule out plagiarism. Next, the editor-in-chief or one of the members of the Editorial Committee approves the article to be sent to peer reviewers. They receive an invitation email with the abstract of the article and, if they accept, the full text of the article and a dynamic Excel table are sent as a guide for their evaluation. It is worth noting that reviewers will not know the authors' names or institutional affiliations in advance.

You may find some comments made by one of the editors in the full text version; therefore, activate the 'Review' action in Word.

Some references on how to review a manuscript may be useful [1-3].

During the review process, it is very important that you download the bibliographic references, verify that there are no orphan citations, and that the citations match the corresponding reference in NLM or Vancouver format [4].

As a general rule, the overall structure of articles will be governed by the uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals [5].

Comments for authors

- Summarise the main findings of your review in an introductory paragraph and then provide constructive comments.
- Major and minor revisions.

A major revision is one that relates to the substance of the article; minor revisions refer to formal aspects. It is important that you specify in your comments whether major, minor, or both types of revisions are required.

- As far as possible, do not suggest adding references that you have authored, unless they are specifically applicable to the article under review.
- In the event of a tie regarding the decision to publish an article, the editor-in-chief or a member of the Editorial Committee will make the final decision.
- In comments to authors, do not mention whether the article has been accepted for publication or not. This comment is for the editor only.

Comments for the editor (confidential)

These are comments regarding the acceptance or rejection of the article for publication and the arguments supporting that decision. It is not necessary to repeat the comments and suggestions made to the authors.

Specific guidelines for the type of publication

- 1. Structured abstract:** the abstract of the article must comply with the recommendations for writing a structured abstract in accordance with the National Library of Medicine guidelines [6].
- 2. Literature reviews**
 - **Systematic literature reviews:** systematic reviews must comply with the PRISMA 2009 and 2020 statements [7] with their respective checklist and flow chart, and AMSTAR 2 [8]. The Spanish version of the PRISMA statement is available at [9].
 - **Exploratory systematic reviews (scoping reviews):** PRISMA-ScR checklist [10].
 - **Narrative reviews:** SANRA scale [11].

3. **Controlled clinical trials:** controlled clinical trials must follow the parameters of the CONSORT statement [12] and, if artificial intelligence is used, CONSORT-AI [13] and SPIRIT-AI [14].
4. **Clinical practice guidelines:** RIGHT statement [15].
5. **Observational studies in epidemiology:** for reporting observational studies in epidemiology, it is recommended to use STROBE (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) [16-18].
6. **Case reports:** case reports should comply with CARE guidelines and the corresponding checklist [19].
7. **Quality of studies on medical education:** MERSQUI [20-22].
8. **Quality of studies on diagnostic methods:** QUADAS-2 [23], QAREL [24].
9. **Evaluation of simulation studies** [25].
10. **Letter to the editor:** we recommend the following references as guidelines for letters to the editor [26,27].

For a more comprehensive guide to standards in scientific publications, please follow this link: [Standards.pdf](#)

The Journal expects reviewers to provide a substantive assessment of the content of the article, taking into account aspects related to the respective format. Aspects such as wording, spelling, and others may be mentioned, but these are more the responsibility of the style editor and section editor. The format of the article, as well as the writing of references, are the responsibility of the editor.

Conflict of interest

The peer reviewer must openly disclose any conflict of interest.

References

1. Hill JA. How to Review a Manuscript. *J Electrocardiol.* 2016; Mar 1;49(2):109-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelectrocard.2016.01.001>
2. Larson BP, Chung KC. A systematic review of peer review for scientific manuscripts. *Hand (N Y).* 2012 Mar;7(1):37-44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11552-012-9392-6>
3. Roberts LW, Coverdale J, Edenharder K, Louie A. How to review a manuscript: A “down-to-earth” approach. *Academic Psychiatry.* 2004 Jun;28(2):81-7. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ap.28.2.81>
4. Patrias K, Wendling D. Citing Medicine. The NLM Style Guide for Authors, Editors, and Publishers. 2nd edition. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association. Bethesda: National Library of Medicine; 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK7256/>
5. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication. *J Pharmacol Pharmacother.* 2010;1(1):42-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0976500X2010010>
6. National Library of Medicine. Structured Abstracts. What are structured abstracts? Available from: https://www.nlm.nih.gov/bsd/policy/structured_abstracts.html
7. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ.* 29 March 2021;372. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4>
8. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ.* 2017;358:4008. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008>
9. Yepes-Núñez JJ, Urrútia G, Romero-García M, Alonso-Fernández S. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Rev Esp Cardiol.* 2021;74(9):790–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.recsep.2021.06.016>
10. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169(7):467–73. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
11. Baethge C, Goldbeck-Wood S, Mertens S. SANRA—a scale for the quality assessment of narrative review articles. *Res Integr Peer Rev.* 2019;4(1):2–8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0064-8>
12. Cuschieri S. The CONSORT statement. *Saudi J Anaesth [Internet].* 1 April 2019 [cited 24 February 2023];13(Suppl 1):S27–30. https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_559_18
13. Liu X, Rivera SC, Moher D, Calvert MJ, Denniston AK. Reporting guidelines for clinical trial reports for interventions involving artificial intelligence: the CONSORT-AI Extension. *BMJ.* 9 September 2020;370. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3164>

14. Rivera SC, Liu X, Chan AW, Denniston AK, Calvert MJ. Guidelines for clinical trial protocols for interventions involving artificial intelligence: the SPIRIT-AI Extension. *BMJ*. 9 September 2020;370. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3210>
15. Chen Y, Yang K, Marušić A, Qaseem A, Meerpohl JJ, Flottorp S, et al. A Reporting Tool for Practice Guidelines in Health Care: The RIGHT Statement. *Ann Intern Med*. 17 January 2017;166(2):128–32. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-156>
16. Cuschieri S. The STROBE guidelines. *Saudi J Anaesth*. 1 April 2019;13(Suppl 1):S31–4. https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_543_18
17. Vandembroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pocock SJ, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. *Int J Surg*. 2014 Dec;12(12):1500–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.014>
18. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandembroucke JP, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *PLoS Med*. 2007 Oct 16;4(10):e296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008>
19. Gagnier JJ, Kienle G, Altman DG, Moher D, Sox H, Riley D, et al. The CARE guidelines: Consensus-based clinical case reporting guideline development. *BMJ Case Rep*. 2013;1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bcr-2013-201554>
20. Smith RP, Learman LA. A plea for MERSQI: The medical education research study quality instrument. *Obstetrics and Gynaecology*. 1 October 2017;130(4):686–90. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000002091>
21. Cook DA, Reed DA. Appraising the Quality of Medical Education Research Methods: The Medical Education Research Study Quality Instrument and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale-Education. *Academic Medicine*. 31 August 2015;90(8):1067–76. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000786>
22. Reed D, Beckman T, Wright S. An assessment of the methodologic quality of medical education research studies published in *The American Journal of Surgery*. *The American Journal of Surgery*. 1 September 2009;198(3):442–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2009.01.024>
23. Whiting PF, Rutjes AWS, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, et al. QUADAS-2: A Revised Tool for the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies. *Ann Intern Med*. 18 October 2011;155(8):529. <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009>
24. Lucas NP, Macaskill P, Irwig L, Bogduk N. The development of a quality appraisal tool for studies of diagnostic reliability (QAREL). *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2010 Aug;63(8):854–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.10.002>
25. Cheng A, Kessler D, Mackinnon R, Chang TP, Nadkarni VM, Hunt EA, et al. Reporting Guidelines for Health Care Simulation Research: Extensions to the CONSORT and STROBE Statements. *Clin Simul Nurs*. 2016;12(8):iii–xiii. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SIH.0000000000000150>

26. Castro-Rodríguez Y. Letters to the editor in scientific publications. Considerations for their preparation. *Odontoestomatología*. 17 May 2021;23(37). Available from: http://www.scielo.edu.uy/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1688-93392021000101205&lng=es&nrm=iso&tlng=es
27. Sürer E, Yaman Ö. How to write an editorial letter? *Türk Uroloji Dergisi*. 2013;39(SUPPL. 1):41-3. PMID: PMC4548563

Yours sincerely,

Fernando Alvarez-Lopez, PhD

Editor-in-chief

Archivos de Medicina Journal (Manizales)