Reviewer Guideline by A.Holzinger, 2002

0) Abstract, Overview and Introduction, i.e. gives the abstract
   a) a quick summary of the **main ideas,**
   b) an **overview on the results**
   c) and **stimulates curiosity?**

Would you grade it as ❑1) excellent ❑ 2) good ❑ 3) fair or ❑ 4) poor ❑ 5) inadequate

1) Overall clarity of ideas, i.e. are the **ideas clear** and **understandable**?
Would you grade it as ❑1) excellent ❑ 2) good ❑ 3) fair or ❑ 4) poor ❑ 5) inadequate

2) **Relevant contribution** to the field of knowledge, i.e. is the paper **relevant** to the audience and **scope of the audience**?
Would you grade it as ❑1) excellent ❑ 2) good ❑ 3) fair or ❑ 4) poor ❑ 5) inadequate

3) Sufficient review of literature, i.e. did the authors consider enough of **relevant** and **acknowledged literature**?
Would you grade it as ❑1) excellent ❑ 2) good ❑ 3) fair or ❑ 4) poor ❑ 5) inadequate

4) Design of study, i.e. is the **experimental design** appropriate and decent?
Would you grade it as ❑1) excellent ❑ 2) good ❑ 3) fair or ❑ 4) poor ❑ 5) inadequate

5) Presentation and Interpretation of findings, i.e. are the findings **well presented, sufficiently discussed** and in **good relation to the given theory**?
Would you grade it as ❑1) excellent ❑ 2) good ❑ 3) fair or ❑ 4) poor ❑ 5) inadequate

6) Discussion and conclusion, i.e. is the discussion relevant, helps to clarify the main ideas and is the **conclusion sufficient** and **gives future directions**?
Would you grade it as ❑1) excellent ❑ 2) good ❑ 3) fair or ❑ 4) poor ❑ 5) inadequate

7) Presentation, i.e. is the grammar, writing style, language proper and are all tables and graphics and images relevant?
Would you grade it as ❑1) excellent ❑ 2) good ❑ 3) fair ❑ 4) poor ❑ 5) inadequate

■