Please complete and return a *separate review form* for each proposed policy statement to policy@apha.org by March 21, 2023. **Items marked with an asterisk \* must be completed for the review to be considered by the Science Board and Joint Policy Committee.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy Statement Number (e.g. A-1) & Title\*** |  |
| **Reviewer’s Name\***  |  |
| **Email\*** |  |
| **Section/SPIG/Caucus/Affiliate\*** |  |
| **Reviewer’s area of expertise** |  |
| **Are you submitting as an individual or are you submitting the comments reviewed and approved by a Member Unit (Section/SPIG/Caucus/Forum/Student Assembly/Affiliate?)\***  |  |
| **Signature of member unit leader if comments are submitted on behalf od member unit (Chair, Policy Chair, Affiliate President, or ARGC)\* (if applicable)** |  |

**Reviewer Disclosure Statement\***

Reviewer must disclose any relationship of a financial, professional, or personal nature that may have an impact on their ability to objectively review the policy statement proposal or may be perceived as a conflict of interest. If there is no conflict of interest, please write “no conflict.”

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Does the **PROBLEM STATEMENT** adequately describe the extent of the problem?
	1. Does description of problem include the best available evidence?
	2. Are there important facts that are missing from the problem statement? If so, describe them.
	3. Are all relevant ethical, political equity, and economic issues identified? If not, please indicate additional issues that should be identified?
	4. Are your discipline or Member Unit’s perspectives and literature included? If not, please provide additional viewpoints and/or references.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Does the proposal describe what **STRATEGY(IES)** is/are being **PROPOSED TO ADDRESS** the problem?
	1. Is the proposed strategy evidence-based, ethical, equitable and reasonable? If not, describe why not.
	2. What other strategies, if any, should be considered? Are these strategies evidence-based, ethical and equitable?
	3. Should additional evidence for proposed or other strategies be included? If so, please provide data or references that should be considered.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Is the evidence provided for the described problem adequately critiqued?
	1. Are the **OPPOSING OR ALTERNATIVE VIEWS** evidence-based, ethical, equitable and reasonable? If not, describe why not.
	2. Do the authors adequately refute the opposing views to the problem statement and strategies presented? If not, describe why not.
	3. Were any opposing views missing?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Are the **ACTION STEPS** evidence-based, ethical, equitable andfeasible? If not, specify which action steps are questionable and explain why?
	1. Do you/your Member Unit support the proposed action steps? If not, which action steps would you recommend against – and why.
	2. Are there additional action steps that need to be considered?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Overall assessment of proposal**

* **Positive** - Policy statement is scientifically sound and APHA should support the proposed action steps.
* **Conditional** – Policy statement requires some revision to strengthen the arguments and evidence presented before APHA should recommend the proposed action steps.
* **Negative** - Policy statement lacks or improperly cites scientific evidence, arguments presented are biased or one-sided. APHA should not support the proposal at this time.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Suggestions for improvement:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |