

Reviewing guidelines

(version 0.1)

Below you will find a table containing 12 rubrics that will help you assess the quality of the article you are reviewing. Their structure and order mimics the structure of a typical empirical study report.

The aspect of the paper you are estimating in each rubric can be found in the “items” column. “Additional notes” column contains more details about the parameters you should pay the most attention to.

For every item you will need to rate the quality of the particular aspect of the paper on a scale from 1 to 4. The examples of lowest (terrible quality) and highest (fantastic quality) ratings are provided in the table for each rubric. Rating 2 and 3 indicate slightly below and above mediocre quality, respectively.

In addition to your numerical assessment of each rubric – please write a short paragraph describing your choice. For example, if you gave the paper a rating of 2 for item 4 “Method: sampling”, it would be appropriate to write something like: “The sampling details are severely lacking. The authors specified the initial sample size, but none of the demographic characteristics were reported. Furthermore, it is evident that some participants were excluded from the final sample. Yet, the exclusion criteria (or even number) were never discussed.”

Ideally, your 12 paragraphs of commentaries should form a somewhat coherent complete text. A reader should be able to get a sense of the quality of the paper by just reading the resulting review without even looking at your numerical responses.

If a study contains multiple experiments – your assessment should reflect the quality of the experiment with the lowest quality. A paper with 4 amazing experiments and 1 terrible experiment should receive low scores on the review. Some scholarly articles might conform to the proposed structure poorly (especially if the paper is a review or a meta-analysis). If this is the case – use your best judgment to adapt the rubrics.

Finally, please keep in mind that these rubrics are in early stages of development. Any feedback about the rubrics themselves, the notes, the endpoints on the scale you can provide will help immensely in our endeavor. Were some items redundant? Do you wish we had some items that are currently missing? Did you find the wording (or the task itself) confusing at times? Please let us know! We greatly appreciate it.

Item #	Section	Items	Additional notes	Low-end of the scale	Rating 1	Rating 2	Rating 3	Rating 4	High-end of the scale
1	Abstract	How well are the key findings summarized in a narrative form?	How well does the abstract reflect the actual content of the paper? Is it accurate and concise or confusing and misleading?	Confusing and misleading	1	2	3	4	Accurate and concise
2	Introduction : previous studies	How thoroughly are the relevant contemporary studies summarized? Is their relevancy explained?	Did the authors adequately set the stage for their study?	No theoretical background provided whatsoever	1	2	3	4	Provided summary is complete and intuitively leads to the current study
3	Introduction : research question	Is the focal research question clearly laid out in the introduction?	Ideally hypotheses should be explicitly spelled out	No research question or hypotheses mentioned	1	2	3	4	The research question and hypotheses are clearly stated
4	Method: sampling	How well are the sampling specifications stated?	Initial sample size (+exclusions), basic demographic details, when and how participants were recruited?	No details about sampling	1	2	3	4	Sample size, demographics, sampling procedure, and exclusion criteria are described in detail
5	Method: conditions	How explicitly is the design stated? Are the resulting conditions listed and described?	Do the authors specify the design explicitly, with detailed descriptions of experimental conditions?	Unclear study design	1	2	3	4	Design and conditions are described sufficiently and in detail
6	Method: procedure	How thoroughly is	Is the reader guided through the	Unclear procedure description	1	2	3	4	Extremely detailed and

		the procedure described?	<p>timeline of what activities participants engaged in (and in what order)? Are the properties of the stimuli materials (and used devices if relevant) stated? Would one be able to perfectly reproduce the study using this information?</p>						thorough description of the procedure in its entirety
7	Results: analytic strategy	How well is the analytic strategy described?	<p>Do the authors state what analyses were performed to test the hypotheses? What was the rationale behind their choice? Does their analytic strategy seem appropriate to the design? Was the data preprocessed in any way (averaging, outlier exclusion, etc.)? Why and how?</p>	No commentary on the conducted analyses, no rationale, no preprocessing details	1	2	3	4	The conducted analyses, rationale, and preprocessing details are all clearly stated
8	Results: analyses output	How well are the results of the statistical analyses described?	Were all the relevant statistical analyses test results reported for each corresponding	No analyses results reported	1	2	3	4	Analyses results reported in great detail

			g primary outcome? Was the effect size estimate reported alongside the significance test results?						
9	Discussion: hypotheses	How well do the authors articulate whether the data supported the hypotheses or not?	A statement of support or nonsupport for all hypotheses, whether primary or secondary is expected	No statements addressing whether the hypotheses were supported or not by the data	1	2	3	4	Explicit statements for all hypotheses whether they are supported or not
10	Discussion: relation to other studies	How well are the results discussed in the context of relevant contemporary studies?	Do the authors discuss the similarities and differences between reported results and other work in the field?	No references to other studies	1	2	3	4	Thoughtful and insightful discussion encompassing major contemporary findings
11	Discussion: limitations	Are the limitations of the paper discussed in sufficient detail?	Do the authors discuss the limitations of their study? What would they do differently in the ideal circumstances if they had a chance?	Limitations not discussed	1	2	3	4	Limitations of the study are openly revealed and potential improvements for follow-up research are discussed
12	Discussion: implications	Are the implications sufficiently explored?	Do the authors discuss the implications of the results for future research, programs, or policies?	Implications not mentioned	1	2	3	4	Implications are carefully and thoughtfully discussed