

“Tissue Engineering and Stem Cells” review form example

Assignment type:

This assignment involves a critical literature review guided by several focus questions. Students select their own specific topics for the assignment and they are grouped into sets for peer review, so that students only review work on different topic areas to that of their own assignment. Students submit draft reports via PRAZE and receive peer feedback a week before the final submission is due.

Review form:

Instructions:

Peer review is a common practice in scientific publishing. Virtually all scientific journals send the manuscripts they receive to external reviewers, usually distinguished experts in their field. These reviewers assess the author's work based on novelty and significance of the work presented as well as quality of the manuscript. In doing so, they provide the authors with helpful feedback on how to improve their work. Authors may be required to make minor changes to the manuscript wording, remove surplus data or add additional information. Sometimes they may also be required to perform additional experiments or provide other forms of validation for their data. Based on the reviewer's comments the editor of a journal either accepts a submitted manuscript for publication or rejects it.

For the purpose of this PRAZE exercise you will be put in the place of an external reviewer. Pretend, that I, the editor, asked for your help in reviewing a submitted manuscript. Based on your assessment I will make a decision on whether to accept the manuscript for publication or not. Therefore, I would ask you to provide as much detailed feedback as possible on the manuscript(s) you reviewed. As a minimum, you are required to describe **two positive aspects** of the manuscript(s) and provide **two constructive comments on possible improvements**.

Note: The comments you provide to others will form part of your own assessment.

Assessing the manuscript against specific assignment tasks

1. Does the manuscript clearly state background and significance of engineering the target tissue?
 - Yes, both are clearly stated.
 - Somewhat, but more information is required. [Use the box below to elaborate]
 - No, background and significance are not clear at all. [Provide help to improve using the box below]

Comments/Justification:

For more information about student peer review, visit: <http://peerreview.cis.unimelb.edu.au>

Support for this project has been provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. The views in this project do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.

2. Does the manuscript address current research areas including the key technical problems?
- Yes, current research areas are discussed in detail and key challenges are addressed.
 - Somewhat, a more elaborate discussion would be beneficial. [Elaborate using the box below]
 - No, insufficient detail is provided. [Elaborate using the box below]

Comments/Justification:

3. Commercialisation is a major driver for TE research. Does the manuscript address potential or actual market size and profitability?
- Yes, commercial aspects of engineering the target tissue are discussed in detail.
 - Somewhat, more information is required. [Elaborate using the box below]
 - No, market size and profitability are not discussed. [Provide help to improve using the box below]

Comments/Justification:

4. Does the manuscript discuss clinical applications of the target tissue? If not, does it give reasons why no clinical applications are available to date?
- Yes, clinical applications and/or clinical challenges are discussed.
 - Somewhat, but more discussion is needed [Elaborate using the box below]
 - No, clinical aspects are not discussed. [Provide help to improve using the box below]

Comments/Justification:

Providing detailed feedback

5. Using the box below, provide detailed feedback on two positive aspects of the manuscript.

6. Using the box below provide constructive feedback on how to improve the manuscript. [two suggestions]

Recommendation to the editor

7. Based on the comments you provided above, make a recommendation to the editor whether he/she should accept the manuscript. [You may elaborate using the box below]

Note: This question is designed to teach you to draw a conclusion based on your review of the manuscript. Your recommendation will not be reflected in the mark the author receives for his/her assignment.

- Accept as is.
- Accept with minor revision.
- Accept with major revision.
- Reject.

Comments/Justification:

Ranking of manuscripts

8. Indicate how you would judge the quality of this manuscript relative to the others you reviewed. [indicate how many you reviewed in total using the box below]

- Rank: 1
- Rank: 2
- Rank: 3

Comments/Justification: