

Korean Journal of Anesthesiology (KJA) Standard Peer Review Template

This template is designed to help reviewers of the **Korean Journal of Anesthesiology (KJA)** conduct standardized evaluations of submitted manuscripts. Please assess each section objectively and provide clear, evidence-based comments.

1. Basic Information

- **Manuscript Title:**
- **Manuscript ID:**
- **Date of Review:**
- **Reviewer Name:** *(Optional for blinded review)*
- **Type of Study:** *(e.g., Randomized Controlled Trial, Retrospective Study, Case Report, Meta-analysis, etc.)*

2. Significance and Originality

- Is the research topic academically and clinically important in the field of anesthesiology?
- Does the study provide new insights compared to previous research?
- Is the study objective clearly stated?

Comments:

(Example: This study explores a novel analgesic approach during anesthesia recovery, emphasizing a patient-centered perspective. However, the differentiation from previous studies needs further clarification.)

3. Study Design and Methodology

- Is the study design appropriate?
- Is the sample size calculation appropriate, and is the sample size sufficient?
- Is the statistical method appropriate?
- Are the study variables and measurement methods appropriate?
- Has ethical approval (IRB) been appropriately obtained?

Comments:

(Example: The methodology is generally appropriate, but the lack of a power analysis raises concerns about the statistical reliability of the results.)

4. Results and Interpretation

- Are the study results clearly and logically presented?
- Are the results derived from the statistical methods presented in the Method section, and are they reliable?
- Do the figures and tables effectively convey the study findings?

Comments:

(Example: The results are presented clearly, and the figures are easy to interpret. However, the emphasis on statistical significance should be balanced to avoid overstating findings.)

5. Discussion and Conclusion

- Are the study results compared and interpreted in the context of previous research?
- Has the clinical applicability and generalizability of the study results been discussed?
- Are the study's limitations clearly addressed?
- Does the conclusion appropriately reflect the study's findings?

Comments:

(Example: The discussion lacks a thorough evaluation of study limitations. Additionally, the clinical implications of the results should be more explicitly highlighted.)

6. Overall Quality of the Manuscript

- Is the manuscript logically structured and easy to understand?
- Are there any concerns regarding plagiarism?
- Are references appropriately cited?

Comments:

(Example: The manuscript is well-written overall, but certain terminologies require clarification to

enhance readability.)

7. Final Recommendation

(Please select one and provide justification.)

- **Accept without revision**
- **Minor revision**
- **Major revision & resubmit**
- **Reject**

Final Comments:

(Example: The study presents valuable findings, but revisions in statistical analysis and discussion are needed before acceptance.)