GUIDANCE FOR AMHP REVIEWERS

Your review is important and will assist the editor in deciding whether or not to accept a manuscript for publication. The reviewer is entrusted with directly judging the validity of a manuscript's scientific contribution. Your review can call the attention of the author(s) to areas that may need improvement. In addition to assessing the work, reviewers help authors get their manuscripts into publishable form. Peer review is not the same as simply reading an article. Please ensure that you are able to devote sufficient resources to this process.

Please read the complete manuscript in detail (including tables, graphs, methods, and references) to ensure the:

- article has a clear message
- material is topical and of interest to AMHP readers
- manuscript is unbiased
- methods are appropriate
- results are clearly presented
- data interpretation and conclusions are justified
- references are suitable and fairly represented in the text
- article reads well and there are no ethical concerns (plagiarism, unreported potential conflicts of interest, etc.)

Do not assume that because the authors, laboratory, or technique(s) may be widely published, the submission is by default of sufficient quality for publication. Every manuscript should stand on its own merits. We are asking you to perform a review due to your particular knowledge in the area of the submission – if there are technical issues that are unfamiliar to you, please let the editor know so that additional or alternate reviewers can be selected.

Please start your review by summarizing the article in a short paragraph indicating your understanding of what the authors have done. Give your main impressions of the manuscript, including whether it is novel and interesting, whether it has a sufficient impact and adds to the knowledge base. If you are suggesting revisions, be clear about what actions you want the author(s) to take. Often, an itemized list works well. If English is not the primary language, suggest the authors commission an editorial review by a native English speaker.

Please keep in mind AMHP's readership. Is AMHP the best journal for publication of the article, or are there other publications that would be a better fit? If submitted as original research, is the format appropriate, or would a technical note or case report be more suitable?

TIPS FOR ADDRESSING EACH SECTION

For specific sections of the article (understanding that not all formats will include all of the following components):

TITLE and ABSTRACT:

Do the title and abstract fairly represent the material presented in the article? If not, please suggest alternate titles that more accurately capture the flavor of the submission or changes to the abstract that assist the reader in understanding the content.

INTRODUCTION:

The authors will often summarize previous literature here. Does that summary accurately reflect the current state of understanding of the topic? Are the references representative of current knowledge or superseded by more current research? Are there seminal articles that are NOT referenced? Are the authors fairly reflecting or quoting the content of the referenced information? If the authors are using references to repeat other authors' opinions, those opinions should be quoted exactly. It may be necessary to pull at least a few of the referenced articles to ensure that they are not misrepresented. Do the authors clearly state a hypothesis or research question here? Is that hypothesis or question ultimately addressed by the evaluation the authors have performed (i.e., is the experiment adequately designed to test the hypothesis)?

METHODS:

The scientific validity of the study likely hinges on the ability of the study design to address the hypothesis or research question defined by the authors. Are the methods described so that another researcher could replicate the study? Is the description of what, how, and when data were collected adequate? The authors are likely to be intimately familiar with the process they used, and may not be in a position to judge its comprehensibility to others. In many cases, specific examples of how methods were applied may be useful. Are there other sources of similar data available that could or should have been consulted? Are the data likely to be sufficiently representative for useful conclusions to be drawn? If the authors have disclosed use of generative AI, is there a sufficient statement describing the use, purpose, and efforts made to mitigate the risks of using this technology? More detail regarding the AI Policy for Authors can be found here.

RESULTS:

The results should be clearly presented and credible. If the data are not understandable, please provide guidance for the authors on what should be presented instead. Are there better presentation formats (e.g. graphs or charts vs. tables, bar charts vs. line graphs, or percentages vs. raw data)? Are all the data of interest presented? Are the statistical measures presented comprehensible and adequate to describe the data sets? Does the text describe and complement any figures or tables? If the statistics used are unfamiliar to you, you may want to suggest a statistical review to the editor.

TABLES AND FIGURES:

Read tables and figures carefully. Data presented in tables should not be repeated in figures (and vice versa). Are all data useful, complete, and clear, or confusing and distracting? Are terms in them spelled correctly (spell-check software does not always work on tables and figures), and are all axes, data points, and symbols labeled or otherwise described? Are all of the figures and tables necessary? Do they add to the reader's understanding of the methods or data? Are there tables or figures that SHOULD have been presented in order to further the understanding of the information presented? If you find yourself looking for a diagram of an experimental setup or a line graph of data over time, suggest its inclusion. Are table or graph categories mutually exclusive (overlapping categories can be difficult to understand)? Do the numbers add up and/or make sense based on the text? Are the scales appropriate to the data presented?

DISCUSSION:

Is the hypothesis or research question addressed adequately in the discussion? Are there areas of discussion that are needed or implied by the topic that are not included? Are there areas of discussion that are unnecessary or unrelated to the data presented? Are conclusions clear and well supported by the authors' data? Do the authors adequately address any limitations to their data or conclusions? Do they address alternative explanations for their findings? Sweeping statements should be well corroborated. Do not accept dogma without data; just because a concept is universally believed or practiced does not mean it is correct. On the other hand, a recommendation of rejection (made to the editor only) should be made ONLY if there exist fatal flaws in the experimental design or methodology rather than on disagreement of interpretation. The authors should always be provided an opportunity to reassess and revise interpretation of results if their science is credible.

REFERENCES:

Please carefully evaluate the reference list in your review.

Do the authors draw too extensively from one or two references, raising concerns of plagiarism? Are there multiple or excessive references from the same individual or group? Are the references quoted or summarized accurately? Are they from peer-reviewed journals? If not, that should be clear from the citation.

References should always be listed in use order using the AMHP style described in the Instructions to Authors, and provide complete information about the publication.

Internet links should generally not be used as sole descriptors in references, as these will change over time. Assuming they are not available elsewhere, the title of any downloaded documents should be noted, and any relevant data or data sources accurately described in the text so that others can also utilize this material. Are all references available publicly and are they complete? If not, they should be fully described in the text.

In general, references should not be used to quote other authors' opinions, unless preceded by a discussion of their data. Unless original sources are unavailable, articles should not be used as references that themselves reference the data of interest. If original sources are not utilized, that should be noted along with the reason for the secondary source being referenced instead (due to age or language of original source, for instance). Is sufficient detail provided in references for the reader to locate the information (for example, extensive reference texts should ideally have at least chapter if not page numbers noted). Reference texts should generally reflect the most current editions, unless being used to illustrate an historical point. References should be sufficient to the type of submission: in particular, review articles should be very well referenced.

Finally, once you have submitted your review, you will have the opportunity to read any other reviewers' comments. You should do so, as marked disparities may suggest missed opportunities for analysis, and provide feedback for your next review.

AI POLICY FOR PEER REVIEWERS

Generative AI is no longer on the horizon–it has arrived. As such, it is critical for the integrity and quality of our journal that we establish a policy for both authors and peer reviewers regarding the use of these tools. While there are exciting opportunities for innovation with this new technology, there are also undeniable risks. These include but are not limited to:

loss of control over original data; potential breach of Institutional Review Board approval; inaccuracies introduced by AI hallucinations; perpetuated biases; infringement upon copyrights held by others; and having one's own copyright rendered unenforceable.

The scholarly publishing community appears to have reached a consensus regarding several aspects of if/how generative AI should be permitted in the development and review of research articles. In establishing the policy for AMHP, we have aligned ourselves with leading industry organizations such as the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME), Springer Nature, *Science*, Cambridge University Press, Elsevier, the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA), and the Council of Science Editors (CSE).

The spirit of the policies outlined below is that **authors and reviewers are expected to use generative AI as a polishing tool at best and a translator at most, but not as a replacement for original thought**. Please note that standard referencing software tools are not considered "generative AI" and, therefore, are not subject to these policies.

Our journal staff and Editorial Board are committed to regularly reviewing and revising our policy as technologies continue to develop over time and the industry finds new ways to cope with the inevitable rise of generative AI.

POLICY:

- Peer reviewers must not upload any part of any manuscript to ChatGPT, Large Language Models, and any other generative AI programs, due to concerns about breaching confidentiality terms.
- If generative AI is used in any other capacity during the peer review process, reviewers must disclose the use to the editor(s) when their review is submitted. The statement should include:
    - The name and version of the generative AI tool used.
    - A description of how the generative AI tool was used and for what purpose.
    - The full prompt(s) submitted to the generative AI tool, including the date and time of each query.
- Reviewers are responsible for reviewing all generative AI output with the same careful skepticism as expected of authors, including monitoring for inaccuracy, plagiarism, and bias.
- Any peer review determined to be in violation of our AI policies will be discarded.

If, at any point, you are in doubt about the tools you have used or how you have used them, please contact our Editor-in-Chief, Dr. David Newman, at amhped@asma.org or the Assistant to the Editor, Sandy Kawano, at amhpjournal@asma.org.