

PREVIEW

OPEN REVIEWERS

REVIEW ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

WHAT IS IT AND WHO IS IT FOR?

The Review Assessment Rubric is a tool for anyone who is evaluating a research manuscript's review. This may include a teacher in the context of peer review training, a peer helping the review author evaluate their review, or even the review author themselves to self-evaluate their own review. The rubric comprises 10 statements for which the evaluator is asked to provide a score and a written comment to help improve the review.

This Reviewer Guide is part of a toolkit developed in the context of **PREreview Open Reviewers**, a cohort-based peer review training and mentoring program that pairs early-career researchers with expert reviewers. The other two guides published in the toolkit are the **Bias Reflection Guide** (Foster *et al.*, 2021) and the **Reviewer Guide** (Foster *et al.*, 2021).

HOW SHOULD YOU USE IT?

Before starting to use this tool, make sure you have read the manuscript that has been reviewed and the review itself.


Read the 10 statements in the rubric, and for each provide a score as indicated below, as well as a short explanation and examples, when applicable.

Each statement should be scored **1–5**, where:



If the statement is not applicable, please score **N/A**.

Ensure your feedback is **constructive** so that the review author can easily incorporate it in their final review. If at all possible, provide context and examples to make your suggestions **clear** and **actionable**.




Ensure your feedback is constructive, clear, and actionable.

RUBRIC

Statement	Score	Explanation, comment, examples
1. The review begins with a concise but informative summary of the findings, highlighting what the study did well, what can be improved, and contextualizing the study within the state of the art in the field (e.g., highlighting its novelty and impact on future research).		
2. After the summary section, the review is structured so that the most important information/feedback is at the beginning (e.g., the body of the review starts with “major concerns” followed by clearly listed “minor concerns”)		
3. What is listed/described as a “major issue” is in fact an issue that the manuscript authors should prioritize addressing, as if left unaddressed, it would compromise the interpretation of the study.		
4. What is listed/described as a “minor issue” is in fact an issue that the manuscript authors should address in order to make the manuscript more readable and accessible to a wide audience, and, if left unaddressed, it would not compromise the interpretation of the study.		
5. The feedback is constructive, clearly delivered, and actionable. Suggested changes to the manuscript are accompanied by an explanation of why the suggestion is made and how the reviewer thinks the best way to address the issue would be (e.g., suggesting a different statistical method and explaining why that would be a better choice).		

RUBRIC

Statement	Score	Explanation, comment, examples
6. The review includes appropriate justification for any request/suggestion of additional analyses and/or experiments. That is, it does NOT request/suggest new analyses and/or experiments that would be unreasonable to ask (e.g., asking for an experiment that the laboratory is not equipped to do) or goes beyond the scope of the study.		
7. The review incorporates a constructive criticism style throughout, and strikes a balance between strengths and weaknesses of the study.		
8. The feedback is decoupled from the study suitability for publication in any given journal.		
9. The review does not contain any insult, direct critique, or questioning of the expertise of the author(s).		
10. The review has a logical flow from start to finish.		



PREVIEW

REFERENCES

Foster, A., Hindle, S., Murphy, K. M., Saderi, D. (2021). Open Reviewers Bias Reflection Guide. *Zenodo*.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5484052>
Foster, A., Hindle, S., Murphy, K. M., Saderi, D. (2021). Open Reviewers Reviewer Guide. *Zenodo*.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5484087>

A NOTE FOR THE READER

Do you have constructive feedback on this tool? Do you want to talk about your experience using/reading through it? Do you have suggestions on how to improve it? We want to hear it all and engage the community in content creation! So please, if you have the time, consider emailing us at mentoring@prereview.org. Thank you so much!

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION


Conceptualization	Antoinette Foster, Samantha Hindle
Visualization	Samantha Hindle, Katrina M. Murphy, Daniela Saderi
Writing and Editing	Antoinette Foster, Samantha Hindle, Katrina M. Murphy, Daniela Saderi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The PRereview Open Reviewers Team is sincerely grateful to all Stage 1 Review Trainees who participated in the 14-week pilot program and provided us with helpful feedback to the first version of this guide. We thank the PLOS team for the time spent talking with us about best practices in peer review, particularly Dan Morgan, Hannah Harwood, and Lindsay Morton. We would also like to thank the team at eLife for their support in publishing and distributing this guide, in particular Kora Korzec for connecting us with staff, Melissa Harrison for her editorial contributions, and Emily Packer for her communication and dissemination support. Lastly, we want to acknowledge the design work by Dan Gould and the final feedback by the PRereview Leadership Team, including Monica Granados. Thank you all!

CITE THIS WORK AS

Foster, A., Hindle, S., Murphy, K. M., Saderi, D. (2021). Open Reviewers Review Assessment Rubric. *Zenodo*.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5484072> - Copyright 2021 PRereview (CC-BY 4.0)



PREVIEW

prereview.org

Find out more about the [Open Reviewers](#) program. [#OpenReviewers](#)

PREreview is a fiscally sponsored project of [Code for Science and Society](#).

 [@PREreview_](#)
 [PREreview](#)

CATALYZING CHANGE IN
PEER REVIEW THROUGH
EQUITY, OPENNESS,
AND **COLLABORATION**