

Review Report Template (recommended)

* The review report must be prepared in English.

Reviewer's code:	(to be completed by the Academic Editors)
Title of the manuscript:	(to be completed by the reviewer)
A brief summary: <i>(one short paragraph) outlining the aim of the paper, its main contributions and strengths</i>	(to be completed by the reviewer)
Review – quality criteria (evaluation and recommendations)	(to be completed by the reviewer)
Review – technical criteria (evaluation and recommendations)	(to be completed by the reviewer)
Review – presentation criteria (evaluation and recommendations)	(to be completed by the reviewer)

Overall recommendation for the next processing stage of the manuscript (to be detailed below in the appropriate cell). This information will be visible only to journal editors, not to the authors:

Accept in the present form	
Accept with minor correction from the author(s)	
Acceptance to be reconsidered after major revision from the author(s)	
Not suitable for further processing (rejection and declination of resubmission)	

General items that may guide the review report:

- Quality Criteria
 - *Novelty*: Is the question original and well-defined? Do the results provide an advancement of the current knowledge?
 - *Scope*: Does the work fit the journal scope?
 - *Motivation*: Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results
 - *Significance*: Are the results interpreted appropriately? Are they significant? Are all conclusions justified and supported by the results? Are hypotheses carefully identified as such?
 - *Repetition*: Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published?
 - *Quality*: Is the article written in an appropriate way? Are the data and analyses presented appropriately? Are the highest standards for presentation of the results used?
 - *Interest to the Readers*: Are the conclusions interesting for the readership of the journal?
 - *Overall Merit*: Is there an overall benefit to publishing this work? Does the work advance the current knowledge? Do the authors address an important long-standing question? Are the conclusions consistent with the evidence and arguments presented?
- Technical Criteria
 - *Scientific Soundness*: Is the study correctly designed and technically sound? Is the data robust enough to draw conclusions? Are the methods, tools, software, and reagents described with sufficient details to allow another researcher to reproduce the results? Is the raw data available and correct (where applicable)? Do the figures/tables/images/schemes properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand? Is the data interpreted consistently throughout the manuscript?
 - *Clarity of expression*; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts
 - *Citation*: Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing. Are the cited references mostly recent publications (within the last 5 years) and relevant? Does it indicate the inclusion of an excessive number of self-citations? Are the statements and conclusions drawn coherent and supported by the listed citations?
 - *English Level*: Is the English language appropriate and understandable?
- Presentation Criteria
 - *Title*: Is it adequate and appropriate for the content of the article?
 - *Abstract*: Does it contain the essential information of the article? Is it complete? Is it suitable for inclusion by itself in an abstracting service? Does it contain appropriate key-words?
 - *Diagrams, figures, tables and captions*: Are they essential and clear?
 - *Conclusion*: Does the paper contain a clear conclusion. The conclusion should summarise what has been learned and why it is interesting and useful?
- Comments should be focused on the scientific content of the manuscript and should be specific enough for the authors to be able to respond. The content of the review report will be rated by an Academic Editor for the general usefulness to the improvement of the manuscript.
- If the reviewer becomes aware of any scientific misconduct or fraud, plagiarism or any other unethical behaviour related to the manuscript, they should raise these concerns with the academic editor immediately.