


**The supplement review flowchart for papers submitted to a workshop**



<p>- Accept without revision - Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Paper accepted</p>	<p>- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Review round 3 (using JBMS guidelines)</p>	<p>- Reject as not sufficiently sound - Reject as not of sufficient priority to merit acceptance</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Paper rejected</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

JBMS Supplements - REVIEW GUIDELINES (for rounds 2 and 3)

-----

Reviewer's comments should be divided into the following categories:

- 1) Major Compulsory Revisions (which the authors must respond to before a decision on acceptance/publication can be reached). These papers will require the second round of reviews before acceptance.
- 2) Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the authors can be trusted to correct). These papers will not require second round of reviews before acceptance.
- 3) Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the authors can choose to ignore).

Reviewers should make their report as constructive and detailed as possible, so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any deficiencies found.

Reviewers can also provide confidential comments to the organisers/editors.

A review report should also include answers to at least the questions listed below. The organisers can add extra questions that evaluate suitability of the submissions, paper organisation, references, originality, etc.

Reviewers should declare any competing interests that they may have.

REPORT TEMPLATE

-----  
(A) Reviewer's report

-----  
Please number your comments and divide them into:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

The author must respond to these before a decision on acceptance/  
publication can be reached (for example, additional necessary  
experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in  
interpretation).

- Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these (for example, missing labels  
on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes).

- Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose  
to ignore (for example clarifications, data that would be useful but  
not essential).

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the  
assessment questions below constitute the report that will be passed  
on to the authors.

(B) Assessment of the Manuscript

-----  
1) Overall recommendation

- 
- Accept without revision (as it is)
  - Accept after discretionary revisions  
(which the authors can choose to ignore)
  - Accept after minor essential revisions  
(which the authors can be trusted to make)
  - Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors  
have responded to the major compulsory revisions
  - Reject as not sufficiently sound
  - Reject as not of sufficient priority to merit acceptance/publishing

2) Level of interest

-----  
Please indicate how interesting you found the paper:

- An exceptional paper
- A paper of outstanding merit and interest in its field
- A paper of importance in its field
- A paper whose findings are important to those  
with closely related research interests
- A paper of limited interest
- Not of sufficient priority to merit acceptance/publishing

3) Quality of written English

-----  
Please indicate the quality of language in the paper:

- Acceptable
- Needs some language corrections before being published
- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

4) Statistical review

-----  
Is it essential that this paper is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.

- Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
- Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

>>>> ORGANISERS CAN ADD MORE QUESTIONS HERE

(C) Confidential comments to organisers/editors

-----  
Please use this only for comments that relate to ethical or policy issues. Do not use it to repeat all or part of the comments in your review for the authors. These comments will not be included in the report passed to the authors.