

Because the journal's readership is so diverse, a commentary should be written in readily accessible (i.e., jargon-free) terms, and address the question, "what is important about this area of investigation?" Examples would include prose that notes the morbidity and mortality associated with the topic of the accepted article, highlights the desire to meet a clinical need, or admits a lack in understanding of a particular process or pathway. From there, the commentary should move toward provision of a limited but informative background section.



This should be followed by a description relaying the outcomes of the original data study, with particular highlight towards the question that has been addressed by the study. The section on strengths and weaknesses provides the commentary author the potential to review their opinion of the work.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, commentaries should close by notation of the work's contribution to the field and based on that, how the topic in question will and should advance. Commentaries are written in free-flowing text.

Formatting a Commentary article:

- ✓ Include a complete title page (author(s) full name, affiliation, email, word count, key words)
- ✓ 1200 words are allowed, (not including the title page, acknowledgments, references, or figure)
- ✓ a maximum of 20 references
- ✓ an introduction to the problem
- ✓ background on the topic
- ✓ a brief overview of the article(s) it will accompany
- ✓ an evaluation of the article(s)' strengths and weaknesses
- ✓ notation of the importance of the work and discussion of future directions for the field
- ✓ a color illustration that explains the key concepts
- ✓ and a completed electronic submission form

It should be noted that commentaries are subject to peer review by the editors as well as other experts in the field, selected at their discretion and that publication of such works, even with initial editorial invitation, is not guaranteed.