

EXCERPT FROM THE *JOURNAL OF ENDODONTICS* - REVIEWER GUIDELINES

**Note the guidelines below have been slightly adapted to reflect an LLC content review*

Conducting the Review

Reviewing needs to be conducted confidentially, the content you have been asked to review should not be disclosed to a third party. If you wish to elicit an opinion from colleagues or students regarding the content you should let the editor know beforehand. Most editors welcome additional comments, but whoever else is involved will also need to keep the review process confidential.

You should not attempt to contact the author.

Be aware when you submit your review that any recommendations you make will contribute to the final decision made by the editor.

Typically you would be expected to evaluate the article according to the following:

Originality

Is the content sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Does it add to the canon of knowledge? Does the content adhere to the today's standards? Is the research topic an important one? In order to determine its originality and appropriateness, it might be helpful to think of the research in terms of what percentile it is in? You might wish to do a quick literature search using tools such as Scopus to see if there are any reviews of the area. If the research has been covered previously, pass on references of those works to the editor.

Previous Research

If the content builds upon previous research does it reference that work appropriately? Are there any important works that have been omitted? Are the references accurate?

Ethical Issues

Plagiarism: If you suspect that the content is a substantial copy of another work, please let the editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible.

Fraud: It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in content to be untrue, discuss it with the editor.

Other ethical concerns: For medical research, has confidentiality been maintained? Has there been a violation of the accepted norms in the ethical treatment of animal or human subjects? If so, then these should also be identified to the editor any important works that have been omitted? Are the references accurate?

1. Primary author name/credentials/biography/photograph/contact information
2. Co-author(s) (if applicable) name/credentials/biography/photograph/contact information
3. Title
4. Course Description
Course synopsis must not exceed 75 words.

5. Learning Objectives (provide 3)

Three learning objectives must describe the expected outcomes of the online course and must begin with measurable verbs (e.g., list, discuss, describe, evaluate, perform, etc.). Avoid using nonmeasurable verbs such as understand, appreciate, believe, know or learn.

6. CE Test Questions (provide 5)

Submit five questions if approximated course instructional time is three hours or less. Submit 10 questions if course instructional time is more than three hours. Test questions must be representative of the entire course and can be related to course learning objectives and/or pertain to specific facts within the course. Test question format can be multiple choice and/or true/false.

7. References, Additional Resources and Information

Courses must include resources, references and information to aid participants in securing relevant material through online sources and to provide participants with avenues to learn more about the content of the course. Additional resources and information could be in the form of a bibliography, annotated suggested reading list, Web site links to systematic reviews, scholarly resources, noncommercial resources where relevant information or services may be obtained, etc.

8. Author Conditions

Authors must agree to specific conditions for having their content included on the AAE Live Learning Center. Authors must also disclose any conflict of interest which will be provided to participants prior to beginning the course. In deciding what to disclose, authors should carefully consider whether any particular affiliation(s) could cause any embarrassment to the author or the AAE, or whether it could lead to questions regarding the author's motives if such affiliation(s) were made public.