

# Reviewer report ratings

Our editors rate the reviewer reports we receive on a scale of 1 to 5. Below is a summary of what each rating means.



Rating	Summary	Detailed description	Use in decision making	
5	Outstanding—exceptionally detailed and adds valuable insight when informing decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed and very thorough: comments on essentially all sections of the manuscript</li> <li>Comments on the significance of the work within the context of the field</li> <li>Includes a comprehensive comparison with existing literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constructive feedback that enables the author(s) to improve the article</li> <li>Recommendation is clearly justified and consistent with the journal's editorial standards</li> <li>Submitted in the agreed timeframe</li> </ul>	Enough to inform an editorial decision without additional reviewer reports, if necessary
4	Excellent—thorough, detailed, well-justified reviewer report, very useful in informing decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed and thorough: comments on most sections of the manuscript</li> <li>Relevant to the subject of the manuscript and the broader field</li> <li>Includes sufficient comparison with existing literature</li> <li>Constructive feedback that enables the author(s) to improve the article</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendation is justified and consistent with the journal's editorial standards</li> <li>Submitted in the agreed timeframe</li> </ul>	Very useful in making an editorial decision
3	Good—sufficient to inform a decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed but not thorough: comments on some sections of the manuscript in detail, but makes little or no comment on others</li> <li>Or briefer comments relevant to editorial standards, e.g. may be a shorter report when indicating fundamental flaws (reject) or outlining a notable contribution to the literature (accept)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant to the subject of the manuscript and the broader field</li> <li>Includes some, but limited, comparison with existing literature</li> <li>Recommendation is justified but may not be consistent with the journal's editorial standards</li> <li>Submitted in the agreed timeframe</li> </ul>	Useful in making an editorial decision
2	Weak—insufficient detail or unjustified recommendation but may still inform decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited detail</li> <li>Not thorough: doesn't cover most sections of the manuscript</li> <li>No comparison with existing literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No justification for recommendation</li> <li>May be submitted after the agreed timeframe</li> <li>Some evidence of engagement with the review process</li> </ul>	Could inform an editorial decision, but editor will probably need to obtain another reviewer report
1	Poor—unsuitable reviewer report, not suitable for informing decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No detail or thoroughness; may be only one or two sentences long</li> <li>No comparison with existing literature</li> <li>No justification for recommendation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be submitted significantly after the agreed timeframe</li> <li>May contain unethical or rude comments</li> <li>May contain reviewer misconduct, including unnecessary self-citations</li> </ul>	Not useful in informing an editorial decision; editor will need to obtain another reviewer report