

Scientific Review Form

Paper number:	
Paper title:	

1. The form below is intended to provide a structure to evaluating the article in terms of its scientific merit, and to minimise or eliminate the major reasons for rejection through journal peer review. We have constructed the form to enable review of the article according to the general IMRaD structure. Any additional comments outside of this form which the editor feels are important should be added to the Additional Comments box at the end of this form.

2. If any of the sections are not relevant to your review, please indicate this in the corresponding box following each question.

	QUESTION	COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION NEEDED BY AUTHOR BEFORE JOURNAL (RE)SUBMISSION
TITLE & KEYWORDS	Are the title and keywords appropriate to the content, and to the target journal (if provided)?		
ABSTRACT	Does the abstract adequately describe the paper, its main findings, and conclusions?		

INTRODUCTION	Does the Introduction satisfactorily define the hypothesis?		
	Does the Introduction satisfactorily explain the importance of the hypothesis and what was studied?		
	Does the study adequately convey the context of what is already known about the problem/hypothesis?		
	Do the authors adequately express their reason for the choice of experiment or study design?		
	Do the authors adequately express the scientific advantages of their approach? For this question, please also consider whether or not the authors have provided adequate information to enable readers not familiar with the specific field to understand the hypothesis.		

METHODS	Are the study design and methods appropriate to the research objectives?		
	Is sufficient information provided on procedures and replications?		
	Is sufficient information provided on materials and subjects used?		
	Is sufficient detail provided on interventions and outcome measures?		
	Is sufficient detail provided on analysis and statistical methods?		
	Is sufficient information included to enable another researcher to judge the experiment and even to be able to repeat the experiment itself?		
	Are any additional experiments required?		

RESULTS	Are the results clearly explained, without unwarranted interpretation?		
	Have the authors made appropriate use of tables and/or graphs to demonstrate their findings?		
	Is there any duplication of data or findings in the text and figures/tables?		
	Have the authors adequately highlighted their responses to the study questions/hypothesis?		
	Have the authors adequately reported any significant negative results?		

DISCUSSION	Have the authors adequately expressed what is novel and either different or not different to what was previously known about the hypothesis?		
	Have the authors adequately described how their findings move knowledge of the hypothesis forward?		
	Are there any negative results or limitations that are addressed, or should be addressed, in the paper? (<i>Note that this could be relevant to the Conclusions also.</i>)		
CONCLUSIONS	Have the authors adequately summarised the major conclusions, based on synthesis of the results and the Introduction and Discussion?		
	Have the authors adequately summarised the importance of their work, based factually on their results?		

REFERENCES & CITATIONS	Are the citations and references relevant to the study?		
	Are there any important studies that have not been cited?		
	Are any citations missing, or any statements made which don't carry appropriate citation?		
	Is the level of self-citation appropriate, given the context of the study and the article length?		

REPORTING & ETHICAL GUIDELINES	Is the article compliant with the appropriate ethical standards and considerations, especially relating to human or animal subjects?		
	Are conflicts of interest provided?		
	Is the article compliant with any relevant reporting guidelines (e.g. CONSORT)?		
	Have the authors provided funding information (particularly for open – access mandate requirements)?		
	Are there any obvious indications as to plagiarised or un-cited content?		
	If the author has flagged up any sentences or sections that they are concerned could have been inadvertently plagiarised, are there particular recommendations you can provide for how these should be handled?		

JOURNAL SELECTION	In your view, is the target journal selected by the authors appropriate? If not, please provide your rationale and suggest alternative(s).		
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	If relevant, please provide any additional comments or recommendations to the authors not covered by the responses above.		