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**Reviewer Feedback Form**

**Manuscript Title:**

*Originality*: Does the manuscript advance knowledge in the field? Is it novel and interesting to warrant publication?

*Structure*: Is the manuscript clearly laid out? Can you follow the logic from the introduction to the conclusion?

*Title and Abstract*: Do the title and abstract reflect the manuscript as a whole as well as the findings in particular? Are the most salient keywords included with the abstract?

*Introduction*: Overall, how well has the stage been set for what is being reported? Are relevant research and theories summarized? Are important works missing? How was the creative work conceived? Was a theme constructed for the creative work? Are research questions and/or hypotheses delineated? Do the research questions, study objectives, and/or hypotheses stem from the literature review and theories presented?

*Method*: Are the research strategies/design processes clearly described? Is there a justification for the methods used? Is the design suitable for answering the research questions? Is enough detail presented to allow for replication? Was the sampling appropriate? Are constructs properly operationalized? Are reliability and validity information included for measures and methods used when appropriate?

*Results*: Are the results laid out clearly and logically? Have appropriate analyses been conducted if relevant? Are interpretations correct? Are tables and figures used appropriately (to present data that are too complex to describe in the text – to improve readability)? Are tables and figures clear and succinct?

*Discussion/Conclusions*: Are the major findings summarized concisely and accurately? Are the conclusions supported by the results? Has a connection been made to their expectations and previous research cited in the manuscript? Are plausible alternative explanations for findings presented? Are limitations of the study discussed? Is there an explanation of how the study advanced knowledge in the field?

*Implications*: Does the manuscript give adequate attention to practical implications of the work? Does the manuscript fit within the scope of the journal?

*Writing*: Is the writing clear? Has the use of jargon been avoided? Is the writing concise? Are grammar and punctuation correct? Are there typographical errors?

 **Rating Checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **Marginal** | **No** | **N/A** |
| **Originality:**  |
| Manuscript advances knowledge in the field |  |  |  |  |
| **Structure:**  |
| Manuscript clearly laid out |  |  |  |  |
| **Title and Abstract:** |
| Reflect manuscript |  |  |  |  |
| **Introduction:** |
| Relevant research and theories summarized |  |  |  |  |
| Research questions, study objectives, and/or hypotheses delineated |  |  |  |  |
| **Methods:** |
| Research strategies clearly described and justified |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling appropriate |  |  |  |  |
| Constructs operationalized |  |  |  |  |
| Detail provided to allow for replication |  |  |  |  |
| **Results:** |
| Appropriate analyses conducted |  |  |  |  |
| Interpretations of analyses correct |  |  |  |  |
| Tables and figures used appropriately |  |  |  |  |
| **Discussion/Conclusions:** |
| Major findings summarized accurately |  |  |  |  |
| Conclusions supported by results |  |  |  |  |
| Connection made to expectations and previous research |  |  |  |  |
| Limitations of study discussed |  |  |  |  |
| **Implications:** |
| Adequate attention given to practical implications of the work |  |  |  |  |
| Manuscript fits within scope of journal |  |  |  |  |
| **Writing:** |
| Writing clear and concise |  |  |  |  |
| Minimal grammar, punctuation, and/or typographical errors |  |  |  |  |