CONSUMER CHECKLIST for PEER REVIEWING REVIEWS
Cochrane Upper Gastrointestinal and Pancreatic Diseases (UGPD) Review Group

Peer reviewing aims to ensure that research is relevant and of the highest quality. Your comments or criticisms can be incorporated into and improvements made to the protocol or review from the Cochrane UGPD Review Group.

Consumers and patients provide a unique perspective when peer reviewing. You can
- Provide insight into important questions that need to be answered through research
- Indicate the benefits and harms (outcomes) of a treatment that are relevant
- Determine how the research may have an impact or if it is valuable
- Evaluate the logic, flow and clarity of the review or protocol
- And more!

What are Cochrane reviews and who are they for?
Cochrane reviews pull together information and results from many high quality medical studies about a topic in order to provide a clear and accurate picture about the effects (good or bad) of a treatment/intervention.

“The target audience of Cochrane Reviews is people making decisions about health care ... health care professionals, consumers, policy makers with a basic understanding of the underlying disease or [condition].

...Cochrane Reviews should be written so that they are easy to understand by someone with a basic sense of the topic who may not necessarily be an expert in the area. Some explanations of terms and concepts are likely to be helpful and perhaps essential. However, too much explanation can detract from the readability of a review.”

Helpful Tips for Peer Reviewing before starting
1) Read the title or skim through the review and think about what issues or questions you or another consumer might have about the topic.
2) Read the review carefully – making notes if you like.
3) Think about parts you liked/disliked, questions that were answered or that you still have and the flow of the review and review your notes.
4) Fill out the checklist below – feel free to write in comments.
**CHECKLIST**

(Simply click below the question to write in yes/no or to add comments – it will expand automatically)

**TITLE:**

**REVIEWER:**

**Content**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td>Does the title reflect the subject of the review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. a.</strong></td>
<td>Does the background information follow a logical sequence?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **b.** | Does it describe  
- the disease or condition to be treated?  
- the treatment(s)?  
- why or how the treatment(s) could work?  
- the possible benefits and harms of the treatment(s)?  
- patients’ hopes/concerns about this treatment(s)? |
| **3.a.** | Is the purpose of the review clear? |
| **3.b.** | Is there controversy around this treatment and has it been described? |
| **4. a.** | Is it clear which groups of people are being studied? (e.g. adults, children, women, men, people with rheumatoid arthritis, etc.) |
| **b.** | Should other groups be included? (e.g. should people under 65 with OA have been excluded?, should people taking Drug X been excluded?, etc.) |
| **5. a.** | Are the interventions clearly described in the review? E.g. type, timing, dose, place of administration, combination with other interventions, length of intervention, etc. |
| **b.** | Are the interventions commonly used or prescribed and relevant to consumers and patients? (e.g. Are the doses of Drug X usual?, Do people take other medications along with Drug X?) |
6. a. Read and compare the outcomes the authors said they would look at (see types of outcomes section) with what is reported in the results section. Are there any outcomes or benefits and harms that are important to consumers and patients that have not been included (e.g. fatigue, sleep, ability to walk long distances, etc.)? Did the authors provide results for all the outcomes they said they would?

b. If ‘scales’ to measure the outcomes are used, are they described and is the meaning of the ‘final score’ described? (e.g. the scale is from 0 to 10, or a high score indicates more pain, etc.)

c. Are the chances of experiencing the outcomes (benefits or harms) of the intervention described? (e.g. 50% chance of improvement in pain, or 10 more people improve pain, or 3 times more likely to improve pain)

d. Does the review consider how important personal characteristics or other health conditions may affect the success/failure of the intervention and its benefits and harms? (e.g. people with severe pain may improve, people with longstanding rheumatoid arthritis will improve)

Conclusions and implications

7. Were there any results reported that you thought were interesting but not discussed in the discussion section? (e.g. pain was the same with Drug A and placebo, but people were more active – why?)

8. In the implications for further research section – is there more research you would like to see done with this treatment?

9. Are there possible conflicts of interest, bias or influence? (e.g. authors from drug companies, studies from same drug companies, physiotherapy review but no physiotherapist as an author?)

Abstract

10. a. Does the abstract accurately pull out the most important findings and conclusions in the review? (e.g. are the primary outcomes mentioned in the abstract, are any limitations described?)

b. Is the abstract written clearly and concisely?
11. Does the review flow and is it logical?

12. Are there terms that should be defined so that a person who is not an expert in the field but has some knowledge of the topic could read it easily?

13. Are there parts in the review that are not clear?

What points/conclusions/results do you think are the most important to tell a consumer about this review?

Additional comments: