

## **Guidance for SLR reviewers**

### **First Round of Review**

#### **Comments to the Editor (confidential)**

- Are you in some conflict of interest with the reviewed work, even if only seemingly? Please declare any additional considerations that the Editors should know about.
- Do you have any considerations for the acting Editor with respect to the submission, for example, dual publication, ethical issues in the research or presentation of the research, etc.?

#### **Comments to the author(s)**

Reviews should include the following sections:

1. Summary of the goal, hypothesis, methods and results.
2. General comments, including reviewer's recommendation.
3. Line-by-line comments to the author.

Reviews answer the following questions:

- Is the theoretical issue addressed in the paper original? Does it offer novel insights or evidence beyond the currently published work on the topic? Please be specific about the originality of the idea, arguments, methodology, conclusions, etc. If this research were published, would it likely be cited?
- Is the paper clearly and engagingly written? Are there any issues with the flow of the argument, the logic of the predictions or conclusions, or the general comprehensibility of the writing? Please suggest specific places to cut or to augment, if appropriate.
- SLR requires submissions to describe theoretically based and theoretically relevant research. Is the methodology used in the research sound, in the sense that it tests what it is purported to test? Is the author's theory or argument appropriate and credible?
- Are the research methods described clearly enough for other researchers to replicate the study? Do the experimental groups have sufficient numbers of participants?
- Have the data been properly and rigorously analyzed using the appropriate statistical methods? Are the findings clearly presented? Does the statistical reporting follow the APA formatting style?
- Are the conclusions supported by the results? Are the findings discussed in relation to the previous literature?

- Does the paper refer to, and accurately represent, relevant previously published work?
- Does the paper make a sufficiently novel contribution to the field to warrant publication in SLR? If the paper is not suitable as submitted, is it worth developing?

## **Second Round of Review**

### **Comments to the Editor (confidential)**

- Has something changed with respect to your conflict of interest with the reviewed work from the last time you reviewed the paper? Answer only if pertinent.

### **Comments to the author(s)**

Please consider that the author(s) may not have been able to address all reviewer suggestions to your satisfaction because of the word limit (9000 words of body text for research articles, 5000 words for research notes, etc.)

- Has the paper been improved from a theoretical point of view?
- Has the paper been improved methodologically? Do the changes make it sufficiently sound and rigorous?
- Is the originality of the argument or contribution sufficiently highlighted?
- Does the paper adhere to the standards of replicability and data availability?
- Generally speaking, is the paper suitable for publication now?
- If you would like your identity to be revealed to the author(s), please give your name and affiliation. However, note that this information will not be published.