

## **OHDM Peer Reviewer's Checklist for Case Reports**

**Paper No. Title:**

### **Notes for reviewers**

- When answering the following questions please add explanations or comments or recommendations where appropriate. Do not feel constrained to give answers such as yes or no or not applicable when completing the checklist.
- Please phrase these explanations/comments/recommendations in such a way that they can be passed on to the author(s).

### **General**

1. Does the case report conform to the published guidelines for authors submitting papers to the journal?
2. Is it on an important or significant topic?
3. Does the report add to the existing knowledge-base?

### **Presentation**

4. Does the title accurately reflect the case?
5. Does the report have a logical construction?
6. Does the length of the report need adjusting (too long or short)?
7. Is the report written in a clear and easily understandable style?
8. Is the report free of grammatical or typographical errors?

### **Abstract**

9. Is there an abstract that conforms to the journal's published guidelines for authors?
10. Does the abstract present an accurate synopsis of the case?
11. Are key words listed and are they appropriate?

### **Introduction**

12. Is the introduction appropriate to the case report
13. Is the literature review in the introduction, relevant and is it comprehensive?

### **Clinical Report**

14. Is there a full description of the patient's examination with all tests fully described?
15. If applicable, are there initial radiographs, pictures of study casts, clinical photographs, etc and are they of good quality?
16. Is there a differential diagnosis?
17. Is there a clear treatment plan?

18. Are full details of treatment provided?
19. Are details of follow up and after care given?
20. If applicable, are final radiographs, study casts and clinical images provided and are they of good quality

### **Discussion**

21. Does the discussion comprehensively discuss the case in terms of the diagnosis, treatment provided and after care, suggesting alternatives and explaining why they were not followed/used?
22. Does the discussion compare the management of the case with that in previously published reports?

### **Conclusions**

23. Do the conclusions accurately reflect the case ?
24. Are the conclusions clearly set out?

### **Acknowledgements**

25. If relevant, is there a statement of conflict of interest?
26. If relevant, is there a statement of exactly how each author contributed to the paper?
27. If clinical images are included, has the patient's consent been obtained for their inclusion in the report?

### **References**

28. Is the paper fully referenced, are the references accurate, up to date and relevant?

### **Additional suggestions to the authors:**

### **Reviewer's Recommendation to the editor plus any further comments for the editor only**

Accept  
Accept subject to:

Reject