

Components	Questions	Author Checklist	Author Notes	Reviewer Checklist	Reviewer Notes
Project Organization	Is my folder structure logical? Suggestions for best practices by GitHub	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GLIMDATA_R and out folders to separate data.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Well organized and documented
	Is my code in numbered files to indicate the order they should be run?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Numbered 0 to 5. Any files with the same number	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All scripts are numbered, in right order, and documented. deprecated folder is not mentioned in the readme, but I assume it will be removed eventually anyways.
	Are raw data, code, and intermediate outputs separated?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Raw code within X and Y subdirectories in GLIMDATA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Code and data match the file structure and are separated
	Are all inputs and outputs of a script clearly indicated at the beginning and end of the code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Inputs are called via read.csv() or load() at the b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Inputs for 4-Reduce.R and 4-Reduce_ecosystem.R are labeled as GLIMDATA/processed_rylata_2_RData
Project and input metadata	Does file and folder naming complement the workflow?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	See above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	readable and organized
	Includes information about the project - use About's box as a way to organize. This information includes the project overview, hypotheses tested, analysis you want reviewed, project stage.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	See Project Overview - GLIMM - About box	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Is all the code available on GitHub?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All code from inputs provided by ten to products	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Able to fully complete analysis with inputs and code in the repository
	If code is ready to be submitted, is the repository public?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Repository is public!
Code Readability	Have I provided information about the packages used in the code within the scripts?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All packages are called using the packagename	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	constant package conventions
	Have I provided metadata for the raw data?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Raw data are described in the README under 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, well documented
	Are all data in a publicly available data repository? If the data is not in a public repository, see points 1) and 2) below	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All data are available in the github repository. Th	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	im not sure what else to do, but this does definitely work
	1) Are data that will be published when the manuscript is published shared with the reviewer? If not, see below	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2) If data are sensitive in nature with no plan of publication, is simulated data provided to the reviewer?	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Can someone other than the code creator or project participants understand (and access) the workflow and content of the data?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The sequence of code to run and explanations c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, works very well and is both well documented and intuitive
	Is a README provided and does it include the following 5 points of information? See Readme templates and best practices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	great README, has minor typos
	1) the data contents and intermediate outputs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Data inputs are described in 1.Process.R and 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, output for 4.Process.R and 4.Process_ecosystem.R does not match the README
	2) which license did you pick?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MIT License	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	3) do you include descriptions of each file, including scripts and any other files in the repository?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	descriptions and everything match
	4) versions of external packages used and software?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	in README
	5) Have I provided the dimensions of the intermediate products?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	dimensions match
Output Reproducibility	Is my code understandable? Are there comments or an associated markdown document?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes. Comments in each script	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	well commented
	Are these comments describing each code chunk or line?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes
	Is the code logically broken up into sections or into separate files?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, each step of the process makes sense
	Does each file of my code have a brief explanation at the top?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes
Methodological Consistency	Does my code have a consistent style?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I think so?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	maintains consistent conventions and structure, so I think so
	Is the use of external packages clearly documented?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, called consistently each time, documented in the README
	Can the written results be reproduced using the provided code and data?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes. See manuscript, ten is responsible for the w	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, figures and summary statistics are reproduced, model matches paper description
	Can an external reviewer run through the code without having to manipulate it?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes. Don't re-run 6.Run. Outputs given	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, only have to manipulate when selecting the model and data in the analysis section
	Are computationally intensive outputs provided to the reviewer?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes. Don't re-run 8.Run. Outputs given. Also, ou	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, see author notes
	Can the results be reproduced and can the figures be replicated?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, figures made in 8.Visualize.R match paper and interpretations
	Is there a clear link between code and output?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes
	Have I estimated data for out-of-sample prediction? What are the results?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, see step 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, able to reproduce the oos prediction and analysis
	What tests have you done (e.g., unit tests)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	I still don't know what this means, no	<input type="checkbox"/>	n/a
	What tests should another person do to ensure output reproducibility?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I ran everything on two computers. I checked in	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	worked great for me!
	Do the statistical methods I describe in writing match what I have coded?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, see manuscript. I mostly wrote methods re	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	description of implementation and analysis in the methods section is great and matches well, gets at the key points of covariate sensitivity and residual correlation, oos prediction and comparison is documented and matches the output from the analysis. the results and discussion explain the covariate sensitivity and the residual negative correlation, and the results match the output of the analysis. im not sure what makes the
	Are there explanations for methodological (coding and statistical) choices made in comments or markdown?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	yes, hypotheses match the statistical methodology employed and conclusions reached