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**Manuscript Title & ID Number:**

[Insert title here]

**Date of Review:**
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**1. General Comments to the Authors:**

Provide an overall summary of the manuscript, highlighting its strengths and areas for improvement. Be constructive and respectful in tone.

**Summary of the Study:**

Briefly summarize the research question, methods, results, and conclusions.

Example: "This study investigates [topic] using [methods]. The findings suggest [key results], which contribute to [field]."

**Strengths:**

Highlight notable aspects of the manuscript (e.g., originality, relevance, clarity).

Example: "The study addresses an important gap in [field] and employs robust methodology."

**General Concerns:**

Outline any overarching issues (e.g., clarity, methodological flaws, or lack of novelty).

Example: "The manuscript lacks sufficient detail in the Methods section to allow replication."

**2. Specific Comments:**

Provide detailed feedback organized by sections of the manuscript. Use numbering for clarity.

**Abstract:**

Is the abstract clear and concise? Does it summarize the study effectively?

**Introduction:**

Does the introduction provide sufficient background and clearly state the research question?

**Methods:**

Are the methods described in enough detail to allow replication? Are they appropriate for addressing the research question?

**Results:**

Are the results presented clearly with appropriate use of tables/figures? Are statistical analyses robust and valid?

**Discussion:**

Does the discussion contextualize findings within existing literature? Are limitations acknowledged?

**References:**

Are references relevant and up-to-date? Are there any missing citations?

**3. Grading Criteria:**

Assign grades based on key aspects of the paper. Use a scale (e.g., Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Grade | Comments |
| Originality (e.g., Is this work novel or does it replicate existing studies?) |  |  |
| Scientific Rigor (e.g., Were methods robust and analyses appropriate?) |  |  |
| Clarity of Writing (e.g., Is the manuscript well-organized and free from grammatical errors?) |  |  |
| Relevance to Field (e.g., Does this study advance knowledge in its field?) |  |  |

**4. Recommendation:**

Select one of the following options and provide justification:

**Accept as is:**

Justification: [Briefly explain why no changes are needed.]

**Revise and Reconsider:**

Justification: [List major revisions required before reconsideration.]

**Reject:**

Justification: [Explain why this paper is not suitable for publication.]

**5. Confidential Comments to the Editor:**

Kindly provide any more suggestions that can help the editor decide but aren't disclosed to the authors.

Example: "While this study has merit, it lacks sufficient novelty to warrant publication in this high-impact journal."
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