

## Farmeconomia. Health Economics and Therapeutic Pathways

### Peer review form

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

|  | Yes | No<br>(Please provide examples and evidence for responses) |
|--|-----|--|
| <b>Topic and content</b>   |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the topic relevant for the journal?</li> </ul>   |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the content important to the field?</li> </ul>   |     |  |
| <b>Title</b>   |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the title reflect the contents of the article?</li> </ul>  |     |  |
| <b>Economic analysis</b>   |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the study rationale adequately described?</li> </ul>   |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the study objectives clearly stated and defined?</li> </ul>   |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to allow others to evaluate and/or replicate the work?</li> </ul> |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data sound and well controlled?</li> </ul>  |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the results answer the research question?</li> </ul>   |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings presented logically with appropriate displays and explanations?</li> </ul>   |     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported</li> </ul>  |     |  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| by the data?  |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the strengths and weaknesses of the analysis?</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the writing, organization, tables and figures be improved?</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings discussed in the light of previous evidence?</li> </ul>   |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the implications of these findings clearly explained?</li> </ul>   |  |  |
| <b>References</b>   |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the references appropriate and relevant?</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are they up to date?</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any obvious, important references that should have been included and have not been?</li> </ul>           |  |  |
| <b>Other issues</b>   |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the paper clearly written?</li> </ul>   |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the paper presented logically (e.g. correct information in each section, logical flow of arguments)?</li> </ul> |  |  |

## Recommended action

- Accept** submission without editorial revisions.
- Revisions required:** the author is invited to revise the manuscript to address specific concerns.
- Resubmit for review:** the author is invited to substantially revise the manuscript in terms of consistency, writing, and organization before reconsideration.
- Resubmit elsewhere:** the author is invited to submit the manuscript to a more appropriate journal.

Name of the journal recommended: \_\_\_\_\_

- Decline submission:** the paper is not adequate for publication in the journal.

## Brief explanation of this recommendation