



EBT Editorial Evaluation for

TEBT-2026-0004

Submission Information Table

Submission Title	Advocating for the Role of Library and Information Specialists in Evidence-Based Toxicology
Submission Reference	TEBT-2026-0004
Handling Editor	Olwenn Martin 0000-0003-2724-7882
Editor Declaration of Interests	The editor is not aware of any conflicts of interest that could compromise their handling of this submission.
Number of Reviewers	1 editor
Submission Type	Comment
Preregistration Category	N/A (Not Applicable) (explanation)
Preprint DOI	10.5281/zenodo.19052549
Report Number	1
Evaluation Stage	Editorial Review

Evaluation Date	28/04/2026
Use of AI in evaluation	Prophy.ai was used to identify suitable peer-reviewers for the manuscript.
Recommendation	Advance

Summary of article and editor recommendations

This is a well-written and engaging commentary making a strong and current case for the crucial role of librarians and information specialists (LIS) in evidence synthesis. It gives a detailed account of the history of evidence-based methods and demonstrates the role of LIS in evidence synthesis beyond supporting the development of reproducible search strategies. A minor comment may be that its focus remains quite general and reader engagement may increase if the specific relevance of the issues and arguments presented to evidence-based toxicology were brought to the fore. All minor comments can be addressed after peer review. The manuscript can advance to peer review.

Checklist of minimum required information

Y = Yes, provided | R = Revisions, additions, or changes recommended | X = Not needed or not applicable

Note: This is a checklist for the availability of information, not for its sufficiency.

#	Status	Item checked
1	Y	Preprint, relevant revision materials, and supplemental material available on Zenodo
2	Y	Full name, affiliations, and ORCIDs (if available) of each author are present
3	X	Correct institutional co-authorship + email to EiC if official publication of EBTC
4	Y	Structured abstract has been provided, if appropriate
5	Y	Author contributions in the form of a CRediT statement have been given
6	Y	Complete funding details are given, or “no funding” is declared
7	R	Disclosure of interests for all authors has been provided or disclosure declined
8	X	Data and code availability is stated and links to both are functional (DAS templates)

9	X	One or more appropriate reporting checklists for submission type have been completed
10	X	Supplemental materials have plain English file names
11	X	For Registered Reports submissions, preregistration level clearly indicated

Comments about minimum required information

Key: Numbered according to the checklist items above, e.g. #5 would be a comment relating to declaration of author contributions

A conflict of interest statement is included. For transparency, we would nonetheless recommend the completion of the suggested template for a more informative declaration of all interests, no solely competing interests.

Structured Evaluation

Editorial note: For EBT, the goal of an expert commentary is to engage readers in thoughtful dialogue and potentially influence their perspectives on a topic of (perhaps unrealised) contemporary relevance. It should be persuasive, thought-provoking writing. See the notes below the report for further guidance.

KEY: R = Revisions recommended. N = No issues identified at this time. X = Not applicable.

Domain	1. Hook and focus
Evaluation Question	Does the article command the reader's attention and resolve its central contentions?
Answer	No issues identified during editorial review that should be addressed prior to peer-review
Specific Issues	N Catching of reader's attention with compelling hook or anecdote R Currency and relevance of topic to scientific discourse N Clarity of call to action or proposed solution
Comments	I really enjoyed reading this commentary that is written in a fluid and engaging style. The issue is very relevant to the current challenges faced in evidence-based synthesis. Although its focus is framed around toxicology, most of the arguments presented are equally valid in most fields and not necessarily specific to toxicology. This could be improved. The call to action is clear, but could equally be made more specific to evidence-based toxicology.

Domain	2. Strength of argument
--------	-------------------------

Evaluation Question	Does the article present a clear, reasoned argument?
Answer	No issues identified during editorial review that should be addressed prior to peer-review
Specific Issues	N Clarity and conciseness of thesis N Structure of arguments, including transitions between ideas N Persuasiveness of evidence R Acknowledgement of opposing viewpoints
Comments	This commentary logically articulates clear arguments that are well-supported by evidence. Whilst it makes a convincing case, it may benefit from acknowledging and briefly discussing potential opposing viewpoints.

Domain	3. Reader engagement
Evaluation Question	Is the article written in an accessible and engaging style?
Answer	No issues identified during editorial review that should be addressed prior to peer-review
Specific Issues	N Use of jargon and technical language N Tone N Personal connection
Comments	The commentary is written in a very accessible and engaging style. If I had to make any comment, I believe the use of 'we', making clear to the reader that the co-authors themselves are librarians/information specialists, comes rather late in the piece. This personal connection of the authors to the topic could be made clearer at the beginning of the text. You may also want to review the manuscript for instances where the passive voice is used when presenting your own work.

Domain	4. Length, language, and structuring
Evaluation Question	Is the article of appropriate length, structure, and linguistic accuracy?
Answer	No issues identified during editorial review that should be addressed prior to peer-review
Specific Issues	N Length N Ease of reading for non-native speaker N Structuring, e.g. use of lists, subheadings, summaries, etc.

Comments	The language, length and structure conveyed the message effectively.
-----------------	--

Notes on EBT's criteria for evaluating expert commentaries

Created with the support of ChatGPT 3.5 (OpenAI, date of use: 17 August 2023).

For expert commentaries submitted to *Evidence-Based Toxicology*, we look for hook and focus, strength of argument, reader engagement, and length and language. Under each of these main themes, we consider the following issues:

Hook and focus

Strong and Engaging Introduction: Capturing the reader's attention right from the beginning with a compelling hook or anecdote that introduces the topic and sets the tone for the rest of the article.

Relevance and Timeliness: Choosing a topic that is current and relevant to the public discourse. Editorial articles are most impactful when they address issues that are currently capturing people's attention - or at least make a strong case for why an issue ought to be capturing attention.

Call to Action or Proposed Solution: Concluding your article by summarising your main points and offering a clear call to action or proposed solution. Encourage readers to think critically about the issue and take tangible steps based on your insights.

Strength of argument

Clear and Concise Thesis: Clearly stating your main argument or thesis in a concise and focused manner. Your thesis should be debatable and thought-provoking, inviting readers to engage with your perspective.

Well-Structured Arguments: Organising your article into distinct paragraphs or sections, each focusing on a specific point that supports your thesis. Make sure each argument is logically presented and supported by evidence, examples, or data. Use transitions to guide readers smoothly from one point to the next.

Persuasive Evidence: Using a variety of credible sources, statistics, anecdotes, expert opinions, and real-life examples to bolster your arguments. Strong evidence helps make your case more convincing and relatable.

Counterarguments and Rebuttals: Addressing potential counterarguments to your thesis and provide thoughtful rebuttals. Acknowledging opposing viewpoints demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the issue and strengthens your own argument.

Reader engagement

Clarity and Readability: Writing in a clear, concise, and accessible style. Avoid jargon and complex language that might alienate readers.

Engaging Voice and Tone: Using a tone that is appropriate for the subject matter and resonates with your target audience. Your writing should be passionate, engaging, and relatable, inviting readers to connect with your viewpoint.

Personal Connection: Sharing personal anecdotes, experiences, or emotions that connect you to the issue. This humanises your perspective and helps readers relate to the topic on a deeper level.

Length and language

Appropriate Length: Keeping your writing concise while ensuring you adequately develop your arguments.

Editing and Proofreading: Articles should be readily understood by readers who speak English well but are not necessarily fluent.