PubFit

PRE-SUBMISSION CHECKLIST
Reporting completeness · not a peer review
SAMPLE · FICTIONAL MANUSCRIPT

At a glance

three questions, answered separately

1. Why this journal
1 to tighten

PUBFIT MATCH
1 incomplete · 3 clear

2. The journal's own requirements
3 missing

PUBFIT CHECK
3 missing · 2 incomplete · 4 clear · 1 not applicable

3. Reporting completeness
4 missing — 3 stop a reviewer, 1 at the desk

PUBFIT DESK · coming soon
4 missing · 4 incomplete · 8 clear

Stops a reviewer

the science cannot be judged until these are answered

- ☒ C1.3 — No participant flow diagram. Numbers screened, randomised, allocated, followed up and analysed are not given per group.
- ☒ C1.4 — No trial registration number or protocol cited, so the reported outcomes cannot be checked against the planned ones.
- ☒ C2.7 — Six secondary outcomes are compared at three time points; no correction for multiple comparisons is stated. (p. 5, §2.6 Statistical analysis)

Fails the desk check

cheap to fix, and checked before anyone reads it

- ☒ B1 — Word counts within limits (abstract, main text) — abstract 283 / 250 words — over by 33 (p. 1, Abstract).
- ☒ B5 — Required statements present — ethics, consent and funding given; no competing-interests statement. (p. 9, Declarations)
- ☒ B8 — Trial registration number in the abstract, as this journal requires — not given. (p. 1, Abstract)
- ☒ C4.2 — Every citation resolves to the reference list, none orphaned — cited but not listed: [31] (p. 6, §4 Discussion).

Would strengthen

real, but none of it stops the manuscript

- ◧ A4 — Novelty is stated as a gap ('few trials have examined…'). The guide asks authors to say what the study adds to clinical practice; one sentence at the end of the Introduction would answer it.
- ◧ C1.2 — CONSORT: allocation concealment and blinding of outcome assessors are not described.
- ◧ C2.6, C2.5 — Effect size with 95% CI for the primary outcome only; secondary outcomes give p-values alone, three of them as thresholds.
- ◧ C2.8 — Intention-to-treat is stated; how missing 12-week data were handled is not.
- ◧ B6, B9 — Data 'available on request' with no location; sex reported per group but neither analysed nor declared as a limitation.

Report	**PF-2026-0147**
Issued	**22 September 2026**
Fingerprint	**sha256:4f9c2a1e8b7d6035**
Manuscript	**Home-based, app-guided exercise for knee osteoarthritis (fictional)**
Journal	**[target journal] — fictional requirements**
Design	**Parallel-group randomised controlled trial**
Standard	**CONSORT 2010**
Guidelines	**22 September 2026**
Verify	**pubfit.ai/verify/PF-2026-0147**

A. Why this journal

PUBFIT MATCH

☑	A1	Subject matches areas the journal's scope names explicitly	musculoskeletal rehabilitation, digital health
☑	A2	Study falls outside the journal's stated exclusions	none of the stated exclusions apply
☑	A3	Article type matches an accepted category	original research — randomised trial
◧	A4	Novelty claimed, in the terms this journal asks for	'few trials have examined…' — gap stated, contribution to practice not

B. The journal's own requirements

PUBFIT CHECK

☒	B1	Word counts within limits (abstract, main text)	abstract 283 / 250 words — over by 33 p. 1, Abstract
☑	B2	Structure matches the required section headings	4 sections, 11 subsections
☑	B3	Citation style follows the journal's rule at submission	numbered, Vancouver (34 cites)
☑	B4	Figure and table limits, formats and resolution	2 figures + 3 tables; limit 6 in total
☒	B5	Required statements present (ethics, consent, funding, conflicts)	competing interests absent p. 9, Declarations
◧	B6	Data availability statement in the required form	'available on request' — no location p. 9, Data availability
☑	B7	Keywords within the number the journal allows	5 / 6
☒	B8	Trial registration number given in the abstract (required by this journal)	not given p. 1, Abstract
◧	B9	Sex and gender reporting addressed, or declared as a limitation (SAGER)	sex given per group; not analysed, not a stated limitation p. 4, Table 1
⊖	B10	Article highlights provided	not required by this journal

C. Reporting completeness

PUBFIT DESK · coming soon

C1 Reporting standard

☑	C1.1	Study design named and the matching standard identified	parallel-group RCT; CONSORT 2010 declared p. 3, §2 Methods
◧	C1.2	Checklist items addressed in the text	sequence generation, eligibility, outcomes given; allocation concealment and assessor blinding absent

✗	C1.3	Flow of participants reported (CONSORT diagram)	no flow diagram; numbers analysed per group not given
✗	C1.4	Registration or protocol cited where the standard requires it	no registry number or protocol cited

C2 Statistical reporting

✓	C2.1	Test named for every comparison reported	linear mixed model, χ^2, Mann–Whitney
✓	C2.2	Sample size justified, or its absence acknowledged	power calculation, 80% power, 64 per arm
✓	C2.3	Unit of analysis and n stated per group	n per group in Table 1 and every table
✓	C2.4	Primary outcome pre-specified and reported first	knee pain score at 12 weeks
◧	C2.5	Exact p-values reported rather than thresholds	9 exact, 3 as thresholds
◧	C2.6	Effect sizes with confidence intervals, not significance alone	primary outcome with 95% CI; secondary outcomes p-values only
✗	C2.7	Correction for multiple comparisons stated where applicable	6 secondary outcomes × 3 time points; none stated p. 5, §2.6 Statistical analysis
◧	C2.8	Exclusions and missing data handling described	intention-to-treat stated; missing 12-week data not addressed

C3 Methods reproducibility

✓	C3.1	Every analysis in the Results traceable to a described method	all analyses described in §2.6
✓	C3.2	Intervention described in enough detail to repeat it (TIDieR)	exercises, dose, progression, reminders

C4 Internal consistency

✓	C4.1	Every count and percentage recomputes correctly	all n/N (%) in Tables 1–3 recompute
✗	C4.2	Every citation resolves to the reference list, none orphaned	cited but not listed: [31] p. 6, §4 Discussion

Not assessed, in full

SCOPE LIMIT

— Whether the findings are correct, novel or important.
— Whether the statistical analysis is appropriate or correctly executed.
— Originality, plagiarism or text overlap.
— Image integrity, duplication or manipulation.
— Authorship, ethics approval validity, or any declaration's truthfulness.
— Whether the data support the conclusions.
— Anything not present in the submitted text.

This is not a peer review. Read it as evidence that the manuscript is complete enough to review — never as evidence that it is sound.

Sample report on a fictional manuscript, published to show the format. PubFit Desk (section C) is coming soon.