

Review Quality Instrument (Version 3.2)*
[Posted as supplied by the author]

1. Did the reviewer discuss the importance of the research question?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Discussed extensively	

2. Did the reviewer discuss the originality of the paper?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Discussed extensively with references	

3. Did the reviewer clearly identify the strengths and weaknesses of the method (study design, data collection and data analysis)?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Comprehensive	

4. Did the reviewer make specific useful comments on the writing, organisation, tables and figures of the manuscript?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Extensive	

5. Were the reviewer's comments constructive?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very constructive	

6. Did the reviewer supply appropriate evidence using examples from the paper to substantiate their comments?

1	2	3	4	5
No comments substantiated		Some comments substantiated		All comments substantiated

7. Did the reviewer comment on the author's interpretation of the results?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Discussed extensively	

8. How would you rate the quality of this review overall?

1	2	3	4	5
Poor			Excellent	

* van Rooyen S, Black N, Godlee F. Development of the Review Quality Instrument (RQI) for assessing peer reviews of manuscripts. J Clin Epidemiol 1999;52:625-9