Reviewer report ratings

Our editors rate the reviewer reports we receive on a scale of 1 to 5. Below is a summary of what each rating means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Detailed description</th>
<th>Use in decision making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5      | Outstanding—exceptionally detailed and adds valuable insight when informing decision | • Detailed and very thorough: comments on essentially all sections of the manuscript  
• Comments on the significance of the work within the context of the field  
• Includes a comprehensive comparison with existing literature  
• Constructive feedback that enables the author(s) to improve the article  
• Recommendation is clearly justified and consistent with the journal’s editorial standards  
• Submitted in the agreed timeframe | Enough to inform an editorial decision without additional reviewer reports, if necessary |
| 4      | Excellent—thorough, detailed, well-justified reviewer report, very useful in informing decision | • Detailed and thorough: comments on most sections of the manuscript  
• Relevant to the subject of the manuscript and the broader field  
• Includes sufficient comparison with existing literature  
• Constructive feedback that enables the author(s) to improve the article  
• Recommendation is justified and consistent with the journal’s editorial standards  
• Submitted in the agreed timeframe | Very useful in making an editorial decision |
| 3      | Good—sufficient to inform a decision | • Detailed but not thorough: comments on some sections of the manuscript in detail, but makes little or no comment on others  
• Or briefer comments relevant to editorial standards, e.g. may be a shorter report when indicating fundamental flaws (reject) or outlining a notable contribution to the literature (accept)  
• Relevant to the subject of the manuscript and the broader field  
• Includes some, but limited, comparison with existing literature  
• Recommendation is justified but may not be consistent with the journal’s editorial standards  
• Submitted in the agreed timeframe | Useful in making an editorial decision |
| 2      | Weak—insufficient detail or unjustified recommendation but may still inform decision | • Limited detail  
• Not thorough: doesn’t cover most sections of the manuscript  
• No comparison with existing literature  
• No justification for recommendation  
• No evidence of engagement with the review process | Could inform an editorial decision, but editor will probably need to obtain another reviewer report |
| 1      | Poor—unsuitable reviewer report, not suitable for informing decision | • No detail or thoroughness; may be only one or two sentences long  
• No comparison with existing literature  
• No justification for recommendation  
• May be submitted significantly after the agreed timeframe  
• May contain unethical or rude comments  
• May contain reviewer misconduct, including unnecessary self-citations | Not useful in informing an editorial decision; editor will need to obtain another reviewer report |