

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.

Rating	Summary	Detailed description (should meet most of these criteria)		Use in decision making
5	Outstanding – exceptionally detailed and adds valuable insight when informing decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constructive feedback that enables the author(s) to improve the article Recommendation is clearly justified and consistent with the journal's editorial standards 	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constructive feedback that enables the author(s) to improve the article Recommendation is justified and consistent with the journal's editorial standards 	Very useful in making an editorial decision
3	Good – sufficient to inform a decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	Useful in making an editorial decision
2	Weak – insufficient detail or unjustified recommendation but may still inform decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited detail Not thorough: doesn't cover most sections of the manuscript No comparison with existing literature No justification for recommendation Some evidence of engagement with the review process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May contain unnecessary self-citations May contain evidence of generative AI use which breaches our ethical policy May have missed ethical issues, language issues, or other issues 	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No detail or thoroughness; may be only one or two sentences long No comparison with existing literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for recommendation May contain unethical or rude comments May contain reviewer misconduct 	Not useful in informing an editorial decision; editor will need to obtain another reviewer report