

Credentials Committee Review Form for Unsolicited Article

Code number:	
Short title of submission:	
Dental Discipline: <i>(Delete as necessary)</i>	Endodontics OR Oral Medicine OR Oral Surgery OR Periodontics OR Prosthodontics/Restorative Dentistry Radiology OR Other
Submission Type: <i>(Delete as necessary)</i>	Original Research Study OR Prospective Case Series OR Involved Retrospective Study OR Single Case Report OR Small Case Series OR Vet Dentist at Work OR Step-by-Step OR JVD Foundation article OR JAVMA DIVDP style article OR Other type of article.
CREP value proposed by supervisor:	

REVIEWER'S REPORT *(Delete or add comments as appropriate)*

<p>Is the item accurately categorized (item type) by the supervisor? YES NO Comments:</p> <p>Is the dental discipline accurately categorized? YES NO Comments:</p>
--

For **Original Research, Prospective Case Series** or **Involved Retrospective Case Series** articles:

<p>1. Does the Introduction adequately support the reason for submission? <i>The Introduction is there to introduce and justify conducting the study. It is not meant to be an exhaustive literature review.</i> YES NO Comments:</p>
<p>2. Are Materials/Methods clearly described? <i>Materials and Methods should be in sufficient detail (or make reference to papers containing details of the methodology) that another investigator could repeat the study.</i> YES NO Comments:</p>
<p>3. Are the Results clearly described? <i>All results reported in the paper should be in the Results section and not embellished with repetitive details of</i></p>

<i>methodology or conclusions.</i>	
YES NO	Comments:
4. Are important points brought out in the Discussion section? <i>Not every result deserves discussion, just the important results, and these should be presented in the context of previously published papers or to support conclusions that the author makes from the data presented. .</i>	
YES NO	Comments:
5. Has the appropriate literature been reviewed accurately? <i>The Discussion should include mention of all appropriate literature, including those papers not in agreement with the results in the present paper.</i>	
YES NO	Unable to make this judgment – refer to expert. Comments:
6. Have ethical considerations been raised and/or addressed? <i>Ethical considerations deserve mention when methods used or the item investigated are controversial.</i>	
YES NO N/A	Unable to make this judgment – refer to expert. Comments:
7. Are any illustrations included clear and helpful?	
YES NO N/A	Comments:
8. Is statistical analysis necessary and appropriate and are data and results of analysis presented clearly? <i>Statistical analysis is generally required when conclusions are made based on numerical results. Depending on the hypothesis investigated, statistical analysis methodology varies greatly.</i>	
YES NO N/A	Unable to make judgment – refer to expert. Comments:
9. Are conclusions drawn, and if so, are they appropriate?	
YES NO N/A	Comments:

For **Review Articles**:

1. Are all directly relevant published original-content articles appropriately cited and are any conclusions or recommendations that the author draws from the review appropriate?	
YES NO	Comments:

For JVD **VDaW, Step-by-Step, Foundations** and JAVMA **DIVDP articles**:

1. Are the illustrations and figure legends clear, and are the techniques and comments appropriate?	
YES NO	Comments:

For all types of article:

Is the article clearly written?	YES	NO
Does the article warrant the CREP or First Article/Second Article status recommended by the Supervisor?	YES	NO
Comments:		

SUMMARY and Recommendation: (Mark one)

Note: The Approve/Non-Approve decision is to be based on **content** of the report. If the report is unclear in **presentation** or incomplete in specific **content** areas, but is generally acceptable otherwise, use the **Request for Clarification** option.

<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to review. Quality of the images submitted is too poor to permit review in electronic format. Recommend return to applicant un-reviewed.
<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to complete review. Recommend opinion from expert in area identified above.
<input type="checkbox"/> Full approval.
Number of CREP points you recommend: 05. OR 1 OR 2 (Delete as necessary)
<input type="checkbox"/> Borderline approval. Although the article is not perfectly written, shortcomings in presentation are insufficient to warrant non-approval in an article that is suitable in content .
Number of CREP points you recommend: 05. OR 1 OR 2 (Delete as necessary)
<input type="checkbox"/> Request clarification before Approve/Non-Approve decision is made. Include in Comments (below) exactly what clarification is needed. It is assumed that if the trainee provides the requested material adequately, the article will be approved.
<input type="checkbox"/> Do not approve (requires justification). Use Comment space for specifics
Comments:

Name of Reviewer:

Save this review as: **Code number** and **YourLASTNAME** and **ApproveorNotApprove** and **Number of points you recommend if approved** (e.g. **CREP 0903 Harvey Approve 2 points**). Send it to the Credentials Committee chair by uploading it to DMS **while the document this review relates to is open** (click the [Attach File](#) command on the command bar at the top of the document screen, follow the on-screen instructions to browse to and upload the review file, and then be sure to click [Save Changes](#) on the command line at the top of the screen).