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?