

Reviewer Comment Checklist

Use this checklist when constructing your reviewer comments to ensure that they are clear, comprehensive, and actionable.

Structuring your comments		
	Confidential comment to the Editor (include any comments that you would like to tell the Editor without showing the authors) — Optional	
	General comments to the authors (state your recommendation here)	
	Major comments	
	Minor comments	
General		
	Start with a brief summary of the paper and your general impressions	
	State your recommendation Accept Accept upon minor revisions Accept upon major revisions Reject (this may include a recommendation to resubmit as a different article	
	type or to submit to a different journal)	
	Is the text clearly written?	
	Does the text fit the aims and scope of the journal?	
	Is the paper interesting? Does it encourage further research?	
	Is content presented in the correct location (e.g., results aren't presented in the Discussion section, methods aren't described in the Results section)	
	Do they have any conflicts of interest that should be considered in the acceptance decision?	
Title		
	Does it reflect the content of the paper?	
	Does it include all necessary details (e.g., the study design)?	
Abstract		
	Does it appropriately summarize the paper?	
	Does it include important details and main conclusions?	
	Does it leave out unimportant information?	
Introduction		
	Does it adequately describe the background to the study?	
	Does it state the rationale for the study?	

	Does it identify gaps in the literature to address?
	Does it highlight the novel aspect of the study?
	Does it state the aim, research question, or hypothesis of the study?
Methods	
	Are sufficient details given so that the methods can be reproduced?
	Are sufficient details given so that the results can be properly interpreted?
	Are statistical methods described appropriately? (Sample size? How was sample size determined? What tests were performed? What was the level of significance? Were tests one- or two-tailed?)
	Are the methods used appropriateDo the methods follow best practices?
	Do the methods produce data/results suitable for addressing the research aims?
	Are any methods flawed or misapplied?
Results	
	Are the results presented clearly and logically?
	Do all the results correspond to the methods (e.g., are there any results where it is not clear what method was used to obtain them?)
	Are the figures and tables clear and appropriate?
	Are the amount and nature of the data appropriate?
	Are statistical results presented appropriately?
Discussion	
	Do they give a good overall summary of their main findings (but not simply repeating results)?
	Do they discuss their results with respect to the literature?
	Are the cited studies in the discussion appropriate?
	Do the results appropriately support the discussion and conclusions?
	Do they discuss strengths and limitations of their work?
	Do they discuss areas for future research?
	Do they state clearly whether they met their research aim, answered their research question, or proved/disproved their research hypothesis?
References	
	Are they missing any key studies?
	Are all the references cited in the text?
	Are the references up to date? (It is fine to cite older studies when needed, but they should also not overlook relevant recent work.)
	Are the references balanced, or do they give a skewed view of the literature?