

Referee Review Form

IDEAS IN ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTION uses a standardized review form for every manuscript submitted to the journal; the purpose of the structured review is to minimize subjectivity and bias in the review process. Please be sure to read each question carefully, and follow the corresponding instructions. You will also find it helpful to consult the document, 'Review Pipeline for Manuscript Evaluation' (available at <http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/bitstream/1974/6361/1/iee-ReviewPipelineForManuscriptEvaluation.pdf>)

Optional Submission of Response Paper

As a referee, you have the option of submitting, *in addition to this standard review form*, a response paper (in a separate Word document) which incorporates your comments. In the event that the manuscript currently under review is accepted for publication, your response paper would be considered as a companion paper for publication alongside the accepted paper. This response paper will be reviewed by the original author and editor(s).

Response papers must be submitted within 24 hours of submitting this review form. If you choose to submit a paper, please upload your response paper in Step 4 of the online review process (where you can upload additional files for view by editors and/or authors). Note that the authors do not automatically see this response paper.

Please refer to the 'Peer Review Process' and 'Author Guidelines' sections on the IDEAS IN ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTION website (<http://library.queensu.ca/ojs/index.php/IEE>) for complete instructions on submitting and formatting a response paper.

Manuscript Title:

Corresponding Author:

NOTE, that by submitting your review, you will have agreed to reveal your identity to the author(s) and you will have agreed to have your name (together with affiliation and email address) identified as a reviewer within this paper, should it be accepted for publication.

Referee:



1. Is the commentary novel to the best of your knowledge?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you answered 'Yes' to Question 1, please continue to Question 2. If you answered 'No' to Question 1, please use the space below to provide citation(s) to previous publication(s) of the idea, and then continue to Question 2.

2. Is the commentary well-argued and plausible?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you answered 'Yes' to Question 2, please continue to Question 3. If you answered 'No' to Question 2, please use the space below to explain your reasoning, and then continue to Question 3.

3. Is the commentary likely to have an impact on the subject area?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you answered 'No' to Question 3, please use the space below to explain your reasoning. Then, go directly to the Recommendation section. If you answered 'Yes' to all of Questions 1, 2, and 3, please continue to Question 4. Otherwise, please go directly to the Recommendation section.

4. Has the author effectively illustrated the impact that the commentary will have on the subject area?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you answered 'Yes' to Question 4, please continue to Question 5. If you answered 'No' to Question 4, please use the space below to explain your reasoning, and then continue to Question 5.

5A. Is the commentary similar to any other previous publications to the best of your knowledge?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you answered 'No' to Part A of Question 5, you have finished this review; please continue to the Recommendation section below. If you answered 'Yes' to Part A of Question 5, please continue to Part B.

5B. Has the author cited these previous publications?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you answered 'Yes' to Part B of Question 5, please continue to Question 6. If you answered 'No' to Part B of Question 5, please use the space below to provide citations to these previous publications, then go directly to the Recommendation section.



6. Has the author effectively distinguished these previous publications from the commentary?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you answered 'Yes' to Question 6, you have completed this review; please continue to the Recommendation section. If you answered 'No' to Question 6, please use the space below to explain how they are similar to the commentary, yet different.

Recommendation

The decision to accept or reject a manuscript will be based in part on your responses to the above questions, guided by the Review Pipeline for Manuscript Evaluation. Your general recommendation for the manuscript can also be provided in Step 5 of the "Review Steps", after you complete this form.

Response Paper

If you are submitting a response paper to accompany this review, please check the box below.

☐ I am submitting a response paper with this review.