

Guidelines before accepting to evaluate the manuscript

- Only review manuscripts from your field of expertise.
- Inform potential conflict of interest with the manuscript.
- Make constructive comments and leave notes in order to clarify what, in your conception, was missing.
- Refuse to evaluate if the required knowledge is outside your field of expertise, when there is involvement in the study in question (either directly or indirectly) or if the manuscript is very similar to the work that the referee wishes to produce.
- Make yourself available to carry out subsequent evaluations of the manuscript.
- Do not share or use information obtained during the manuscript evaluation process.
- Do not be influenced by the origin of the manuscript, that is, by the nationality of the author, by religious issues, gender or other characteristics that for some reason bias the reading of the work.

Guidelines during the evaluation process

- Return the assessment in a timely manner. If there is a need to extend the deadline to perform the task, communicate it to the journal.
- If you notice late that the manuscript under evaluation has any type of conflict of interest, contact the journal immediately.
- Strictly follow the journal's editorial policies.
- Do the assessment on your own, without involving other researchers or academics.
- Promptly notify the journal if irregularities are found, such as ethical aspects or double submission of the manuscript.
- Avoid contact with the authors other than through the journal.
- Do not suggest the inclusion of quotes/references from your own work or that of colleagues.
- Do not change ideas in the text or the writing, and the suggestion of writing is allowed by means of comments (in a text box in the file itself or in a separate document).

Guidelines for the preparation of the evaluation report

- Write broad comments for the editor-in-chief, which include the relevance of the manuscript and the possible impact of this publication, in order to make your decision explicit, citing:
 - I) Mandatory corrections: when the referee believes that the manuscript is relevant and there is potential for publication however, adjustments are necessary, so the referee indicates such corrections be made in the work on a mandatory basis.
 - II) Reject: when the referee verifies the absence of originality, impossibility of improving the manuscript, whether writing, content or scientific criteria, without relevance to the academic environment.
 - III) Accept: when the referee deems that no further changes need to be made, the manuscript is ready to be published.

Table 1

Guiding questions to evaluate the manuscript.

Introduction

1. Is the background and literature section up to date and appropriate for the topic?

Yes.

No, authors should (consider): (please list and number in the text field below your suggestions so that the author(s) can more easily follow your instructions or provide rebuttals).

In addition to my experience, additional evaluators should be consulted.

Not applicable.

2. Are the primary (and secondary) objectives clearly stated at the end of the introduction?

Yes.

No, authors should (consider): (please list and number in the text field below your suggestions so that the author(s) can more easily follow your instructions or provide rebuttals).

In addition to my experience, additional evaluators should be consulted.

Not applicable.

Methods

3. Are the study methods (including theory/applicability/modelling) reported in sufficient detail to allow for their replicability or reproducibility?

Yes.

No, authors should (consider): (please list and number in the text field below your suggestions so that the author(s) can more easily follow your instructions or provide rebuttals).

In addition to my experience, additional evaluators should be consulted.

Not applicable.

4. Are statistical analyses, controls, sampling mechanism, and statistical reporting (e.g., P-values, CIs, effect sizes) appropriate and well described?

Yes.

No, authors should (consider): (please list and number in the text field below your suggestions so that the author(s) can more easily follow your instructions or provide rebuttals).

In addition to my experience, additional evaluators should be consulted.

Not applicable.

Results

5. Is the results presentation, including the number of tables and figures, appropriate to best present the study findings?

Yes.

No, authors should (consider): (please list and number in the text field below your suggestions so that the author(s) can more easily follow your instructions or provide rebuttals).

In addition to my experience, additional evaluators should be consulted.

Not applicable.

6. Are additional sub-analyses or statistical measures needed (e.g., reporting of CIs, effect sizes, sensitivity analyses)?

Yes.

No, authors should (consider): (please list and number in the text field below your suggestions so that the author(s) can more easily follow your instructions or provide rebuttals).

In addition to my experience, additional evaluators should be consulted.

Not applicable.

Discussion

7. Is the interpretation of results and study conclusions supported by the data and the study design?

Yes.

No, authors should (consider): (please list and number in the text field below your suggestions so that the author(s) can more easily follow your instructions or provide rebuttals).

In addition to my experience, additional evaluators should be consulted.

Not applicable.

8. Have the authors clearly emphasized the limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument?

Yes.

No, authors should (consider): (please list and number in the text field below your suggestions so that the author(s) can more easily follow your instructions or provide rebuttals).

In addition to my experience, additional evaluators should be consulted.

Not applicable.

Source: Malički and Mehmani (2024).