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Objectives

• Review author goals for *Pediatric Radiology*
  – Discussion, references, tables, and figures

• Highlight reviewer goals
Discussion

• Should be structured in paragraphs that address the following:
  • State whether hypothesis is proven true
    – If no hypothesis, state if purpose was met and what question(s) answered
    – Not a repetition of results section
    – Summarize results
      • Data references from results section should be limited to pertinent data
    – Draw reasonable conclusions from results
    – Compare results to other manuscripts from other researchers
      • Highlight the contributions of the manuscript
    – Clinical implications of manuscript
    – Limitations
      • Thoughtful and honest critical appraisal
Discussion

• State whether hypothesis is proven true
  – If no hypothesis, state if purpose was met and what question(s) answered
  – Not a repetition of results section

• Reviewer
  – Find hypothesis or purpose
  – Assess if question(s) answered
Discussion

• Summarize results
  – Data references from results section should be limited to pertinent data

• Reviewer
  – Has the data been summarized
  – No new data should be introduced
Discussion

• Draw reasonable conclusions from results
• Reviewer
  – What are the conclusions?
  – Can the conclusions be reasonably drawn from the data?
Discussion

• Compare results to manuscripts from other researchers
  – Highlight the contributions of the manuscript

• Reviewer
  – Assess whether the comparison is adequate
  – Are discrepant findings adequately explained?
  – Are there a reasonable number of comparison papers?
  – Requires a brief literature search of the topic to determine if any significant manuscripts not included
Discussion

• Clinical implications of manuscript

• Reviewer
  • What is the impact of the manuscript?
  • How might it alter clinical practice or care?
Discussion

• Limitations
  – Thoughtful and honest critical appraisal

• Reviewer
  – Are limitations reasonable?
  – Are there limitations that are not described?
Conclusions

• Conclusions should be the final paragraph
• Take-home point(s)
  – Highlighting novelty of the study
• Reviewer
  – Are conclusions appropriate based on methods, results, and discussion?
  – Do conclusions mirror the purpose?
  – Is the take-home point clear?
References

• References should be up-to-date, appropriately selected, and in the proper citation format for *Pediatric Radiology*

• Reference number limited for Case Reports and Technical Innovations
  – Limited to 8 references
References

• Reviewer
  – Do references accurately reflect manuscript content?
  – Are there important articles not referenced?
  – Are references properly numbered in the text?
    • Do cited references match the order in the reference list?
  – Are references properly formatted?
  – Is the maximum number of references exceeded?
  – Are there verbatim passages either not cited or not directly quoted?
Tables

• Used to simplify and summarize data
• Use judiciously
• Not just a repeat of data explained in the text
Tables

- Reviewer
  - Do tables simplify data explanation?
    - Is data easily understandable?
  - Too few or too many tables?
  - Too much or too little data?
    - Complex listing of numbers
  - Is table title appropriate?
• Reviewer

• Should data be presented in graphical format?
  – Pie charts for percentages
  – Line graphs for trending data over time
  – Box and whisker plots to depict groups and variability of numerical data through quartiles
Figures

• One of the most important features of an imaging manuscript
  – Some readers may only skim abstract and look at figures...
• Illustrate the major points of the manuscript
• Should be of “textbook” quality
• Appropriate use of arrows to highlight findings
• Caption for each figure should list
  – Gender and age of patient
  – Type of image, image plane, +/- contrast
  – Accurate description of findings
Mid-ventricular short axis late gadolinium enhancement image in a 15 year-old male shows lateral and inferolateral LV wall subepicardial and mid-myocardial late gadolinium enhancement (arrows) consistent with myocarditis.
Figures

• Reviewer
  – Do figures highlight the description of methods/results/discussion?
  – Is the number of figures appropriate?
    • Pictorial essays may necessitate more figures
  – Are figures correctly called out in text?
  – Do captions describe the figure findings accurately?
  – Is there judicious use of arrows?