

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