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Constructive comments about the manuscript’s strengths and weaknesses—preferably numbered—are encouraged, as opposed to simply answering “Yes” or “No” to the questions provided. *If the article is poorly written due to grammatical errors, you do NOT need to correct the English. You may wish to bring it to the attention of the editor, however.*

1. Is it something related to an aspect of medical radiation sciences, including patients, families, health care leaders, policy makers, and medical radiation science professionals?
2. Where relevant, is it organized with a logical flow?
3. Is there evidence that the ethical implications of the submission have been considered?
4. Where relevant, does it use appropriate and current medical imaging terminology?
5. Is the main idea apparent?
6. Does the title accurately and concisely reflect the theme or purpose of the piece?
7. Does the piece provide context (if applicable)?
8. Are there any “lessons learned” that should be highlighted? If so, do they mention implications of results for practice or future research?
9. Is there risk of misinterpretation?
10. Would this piece benefit from further explanation?

*This is a privileged document and the data and findings are the exclusive property of the author(s) and should not be disclosed to others who might use this information in their research. If you have shared responsibility for the review of this manuscript with a colleague, please provide that person’s name and institutional affiliation with your completed review.*