When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by authors new and well defined?
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? (see: Guidelines for authors, Medicinski Glasnik)
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
6. Do the title and abstract convey what has been found?
7. Is the writing acceptable?

Please make your report as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the report overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories.

Major compulsory revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

Minor essential revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

Discretionary revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.
Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the reportthat will be passed on to the authors.

Once you have done this, there are also some questions for you to answer, including one that ask your advice on publication.

Please indicate how interesting you find the manuscript:

An exceptional article (of the kind that might have warranted publication in such journals as Nature, Science, New England Journal of Medicine, Lancet)
An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field (of the kind that might be found in the leading specialist journal in the field)
An article of importance in this field
An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
An article of limited interest
Reject as not of sufficient priority to merit publishing in this journal

Quality of written English

If the standard of writing is a serious impediment to understanding, you should choose the first option below, and we will asko the authors to seek help. If the language is generally acceptabla but has specific problems, some of all of which you have noted in your review, choose second option.
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited.
Needs some language correctios before being published.
Acceptable.

Statistical review

Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reason in your report.
Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
No, the manucsript does not need to be seen by a statistician.