

Questions to guide the reviewer regarding decisions on REVIEW MANUSCRIPTS

1. Does the manuscript provide new information that is not already available in published form?
If **yes**, please provide a description of what you believe is new.
If **no**, does the manuscript present existing information in a new way that will add to the reader's understanding of the field?
If **no**, then unless the manuscript has something else extremely important to offer, the manuscript likely should be rejected.
2. Do the authors provide a sound rationale for writing this manuscript?
If **no**, then the manuscript likely should be rejected.
3. Has the referenced literature been properly analyzed?
If **no**, then the manuscript likely should be rejected or major revisions should be requested.
4. Have the concepts been clearly presented?
If **no**, then the manuscript likely should be rejected or major revision should be requested.

Please list major comments that need to be addressed in a revision (i.e., the manuscript cannot be accepted unless these comments are adequately addressed)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

Please list other comments that you request to be addressed in a revision

- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

Other items to be considered when composing your review (please structure your review using the headings listed below)

The Abstract

- Is there a clear and concise Objective statement?
- Is there a clear and concise Conclusion statement?

The Introduction

- Is the Introduction concise?
- Is the purpose of the manuscript clearly defined, i.e., do the authors provide a rationale for writing this review?
- Do the authors define terms used in the remainder of the manuscript?

Body

- Is the Body of the manuscript concise and clear?
- Do the authors succeed in their objective(s)?
- Do the conclusions appropriately summarize?

Figures and Graphs

- Are the figures and graphs correct and are they appropriately labeled?
- Do the figures and graphs adequately show the important concepts?
- Do arrows need to be added to depict important or subtle findings?
- Do the figure legends provide a clear explanation that allows the figures and graphs to be understood without making reference to the remainder of the manuscript?

Tables

- Do the tables appropriately describe the concepts in the remainder of the manuscript?

References

- Does the reference list follow the format for the journal?
- Does the reference list contain errors?
- Do any important references need to be added?