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1. You have been invited to review a manuscript submitted to a peer reviewed journal. What do you do first?
   ○ a. Read the abstract and assess the topic with your ability to be able to provide an objective review.
   ○ b. Ignore the email invitation as you do not have the time to review.
   ○ c. Immediately accept and go to the score sheet and provide your opinion on the article
   ○ d. Read the abstract and find that the topic is interesting, so you accept the invitation.
   ○ e. Accept the invitation and delegate the task to one of your students as a learning opportunity.

2. Of the selections below, what would be a conflict of interest when asked to review a manuscript?
   ○ a. I can review an article even when I know the author.
   ○ b. An inherent bias (extremely for or against) the topic.
   ○ c. I do not have a statistical background, thus should not review a research article
   ○ d. A & C
   ○ e. A & B

3. You reviewed a research manuscript that had a great design and promising findings. You want to use the findings and share the outcomes with your transplant team and students. Is this conduct within your rights as a reviewer?
   ○ a. Yes. I am a researcher and am always looking for new ways to design a study.
   ○ b. No. The information is confidential.
   ○ c. Yes. I am a mentor to many students and can use this manuscript in my teaching/mentoring activities.
   ○ d. No. I do not know the author.

4. What is the importance of the article title?
   ○ a. It should describe the study and not be limited by word or character counts.
   ○ b. It should catch the readers eye so that they will read it.
   ○ c. It is used to organize the journal table of contents, thus must be short.
   ○ d. It is used for indexing thus includes key points of the study.
5. There are key expectations of the manuscript introduction. What are the details a reviewer should look for in an introduction?
   - a. The historical and informative background leading up to why this study is important.
   - b. Why the study is important
   - c. A logical and concise description of why research in this area is important
   - d. The historical background, including a review of the literature, that describes the current state of the science followed by the research question(s).

6. What information do you assess when critiquing the Setting subheading in the Design/Methods section?
   - a. A description of the design so that the reader knows how data were collected.
   - b. A description of the intervention used so that the reader understands what the participant was asked to do.
   - c. A description of where the study was done
   - d. A description of where the subject completed study tasks.

7. Why is it important that investigators describe the population?
   - a. By describing the population from which the sample is drawn is one way to show that the sample emulates the population at large.
   - b. It isn’t important
   - c. The population is the sample and there is a section for sampling. It is redundant.
   - d. Provides a credible description of the importance of the study

8. You are writing up a review for the editor. You had trouble figuring out if the author answered the research questions. The purpose statement was vague, and the description of the outcomes measures was poorly organized. The reference list was extensive, but 60% were older than 5 years. You provided the author with many ways to strengthen the manuscript, and now must recommend consideration for publication to the editor. Using the information provided, what would you choose?
   - a. Accept without revisions
   - b. Accept with minor revisions
   - c. Accept with major revision
   - d. Reject

9. You have read the manuscript for content, clarity, organization, and are ready to write up your thoughts. What questions can you ask yourself?
   - a. Did the introduction set the stage for the conclusions?
   - b. Did the author answer the questions asked?
c. Is this research significant, original, performed following scientific principles, written clearly, and relevant to the journal audience?

d. All of the above.

10. The key aspects of critiquing the discussion section include.

a. Was the discussion relevant to the findings presented?

b. Did the author describe the strengths of the study?

c. Was the interpretation of the findings appropriate?

d. Did the author state that more research needed to be done?

e. A & C