

Here is a template for writing a peer review for a manuscript under consideration. Broadly, the goal of the peer review process is to provide critical and helpful feedback to make their manuscript as good as it can be. There are several dimensions where the reviewer should contribute feedback and certain areas where I (Ming) consider it inappropriate.

The appropriate areas for feedback include:

1. Existing literature properly cited
2. Technical Implementation Details
 - a. For example - are algorithms properly contextualized and described
3. Clarity of writing and figures
4. Methodology in Evaluating Results
 - a. Was a proper benchmarking conducted, with appropriate ways to mitigate bias
5. Clear presentation of results
6. Enough support from supplemental information of the presented results
7. Availability of data
8. Availability of methods/source code
 - a. Does the software do what it claims
9. Evaluation of conclusions drawn from results
10. Significance to the broader field

What is not appropriate to comment on is:

1. Appropriateness of the work the specific journal
 - a. This is the purview of the editor - not of the reviewer

The broad outline of a review could be as follows:

Paragraph 1 - Summarize the work as presented by the authors, with their main contribution
crispy written

Paragraph 2 - Bulleted list of major concerns and suggested improvements

Paragraph 3 - Bulleted list of minor concerns that likely affect the readability and general presentation of the manuscript

Paragraph 4 - Conclude the overall sentiment of the review and indicate whether the reviewer considers this work to be eventually publishable given the concerns and emphasizes which key issues have the highest priority. This should also indicate broadly the expertise of the reviewer so that it can be used to evaluate the confidence the reviewer has in their own statements.