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Instructions to Reviewers

The Editorial Board of Mayo Clinic Proceedings oversees the reviewer selection process for the journal. The invitation to review a manuscript will be sent from the Editorial Office. We request that you respond as soon as possible by either accepting or declining to review. Once the Editorial Office has received your acceptance to review a manuscript, you will be notified that the manuscript is available in your “Reviewer Center.” We recommend that you format and save your critique using your word processing software and then copy and paste your comments into the appropriate boxes on the score sheet. You may save your score sheet and return to finish the review at a later time by clicking on the “Save as Draft” link at the bottom of the page.

Please use the navigation buttons within the system for moving forward and back. Do not use your browser’s back button. As you use the system the first few times, be sure to read all the instructions completely.

Reviewers should access the Get Help Now link, http://mchelp.manuscriptcentral.com/gethelpnow/training/reviewer/ for tutorials, reviewer guides, and FAQs. Please contact the Editorial Office at (507) 284-2094, Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Central time, with questions regarding journal requirements or policy.

If it becomes apparent that you will not be able to complete the review in the allotted timeframe, please contact the Editorial Office immediately to determine if an extension can be granted or if an alternative reviewer should be sought.

Confidentiality
Mayo Clinic Proceedings uses a single-blinded review process. Reviewer identities are not, and should not be, disclosed to the authors or other reviewers. In addition, authors should not contact those whom they presume to be reviewers of their manuscript.

Manuscripts are confidential intellectual property of the submitting authors. All printed copies of submitted articles should be destroyed upon completion of the review.

Reviewer Eligibility
Please assess your expertise or related perspective to the topic of the manuscript you have been invited to review. Please consider any conflict of interest issues you may have with the topic, authors, or related affiliations that may hinder you from providing a fair and balanced review (if you are unsure, please contact the Editorial Office for clarification). Please note if you have reviewed the manuscript for another journal. Please consider your ability to complete the review in the allotted timeframe (within 2 weeks). If you determine you are ineligible or unable to complete the review for any of these reasons, please decline the invitation and recommend an alternative reviewer.

Reviewer Score Sheet
Please evaluate the manuscript critically and constructively. Reviewer identity is kept confidential. All communications to authors will be forwarded by the Editorial Office and reviewers should not communicate directly with authors. Reviewers should avoid using information in their comments to authors that may inadvertently identify themselves to the authors. Minor grammar and punctuation concerns can be disregarded. These will be addressed during the editing process.

Using the categories listed on the score sheet, please provide a ranking for the manuscript in each category. In the case of certain article types (eg, review articles), some categories may not apply. You may leave these blank.

Please include any concerns of author malfeasance (eg, plagiarism, duplicate publication, bias, conflicts of interest) in the confidential comments to the editor. Recommendations regarding acceptance or rejection of the manuscript should be presented in the confidential comments to the editor section only. Please provide one or two lines supporting these recommendations.

In the comments to authors section, please provide supporting detailed comments that will improve the quality of the submitted work. Include strengths of the research and weaknesses of the presentation, methods, or interpretations of the results. It would be helpful to point out duplication of information within the text, tables, and figures. If you feel the manuscript should be shortened or lengthened in any manner, please provide specific recommendations to the authors. If reference lists are too lengthy, please state which references could be eliminated.

Please note that there are customized score sheets for Concise Reviews for Clinicians and Residents’ Clinic manuscripts. Specific instructions for reviewing these types of manuscript are included directly on the score sheet. Mayo Clinic Proceedings has instituted word count, reference, and figure/table guidelines for each manuscript category. Please use the chart available at https://www.elsevier.com/__data/promis_misc/jmcp-article-types.pdf to
assist you when assessing whether a manuscript exceeds these limits and provide a comment on how the authors could reduce the length of their submission to better adhere to these boundaries.

**Online-Only Supplemental Material**
If the manuscript you are reviewing contains online-only supplemental material, please review these files along with the manuscript. Please determine whether the material is necessary and provide any recommendations as to its length, format, and accuracy.

**Articles Containing CME Credit**
Continuing medical education (CME) credit is typically offered with the Concise Review for Clinicians section and select Thematic Reviews. Please review the objectives and questions/answers to ensure that they match the content of the article.

**Instructions Specific to Case Reports**
The checklist below is provided for your information and pertains to review of Case Reports only. Please rate the submitted Case Report using the following criteria for recommendation for acceptance. If none of the below apply to the Case Report, please recommend rejection and provide comments to the authors for alternative sources of publication (if appropriate).

- The Case Report should be a clinical observation that is the first of its kind and/or an unexpected or unusual observation of a disease process (of relevance to a meaningful number of patients)
  - New disease
  - New syndrome
  - Previously unknown and important manifestation of a common disease
  - New understanding of the pathophysiology of a common disease
- A new (first) observation of an important side effect of a commonly used drug
- A new therapeutic activity of a new treatment, including drugs and non-drug therapies
- The experience, which could be a new treatment, might be the stimulus for further clinical research
- Knowledge about the event could affect other physicians' management of their patients who have a similar situation

**Reviewer Feedback**
Once you have successfully submitted your review, you will receive a confirmation from the Editorial Office. When all invited reviews have been received and a decision on the manuscript has been reached, you will receive a copy of the decision letter, including all reviewers' comments to the authors.

If a decision is reached that was contradictory to your recommendation for the manuscript, please be assured that your comments were carefully considered and closely reviewed by the Editorial Board.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with the peer review process for *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. Your insights and expertise will provide invaluable contributions to the quality of articles published and the field of medicine at large. *Proceedings* publishes a yearly list of reviewers in the December issue as an acknowledgement of your commitment to the journal.