## **REFEREE REPORT**

Please rate the following aspects of the article: (if the response is 'No', where possible please suggest improvements on <i>Information for Authors</i> )	Yes/No
1. Title: Does it clearly describe the article?	
2. Abstract: Does it reflect the content of the article?	
3. Introduction: Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem being investigated?	
4. Graphical presentation: Do the figures describe the data accurately?	
<ul> <li>5. Method: If the methods were new, were they explained in detail?</li> <li>Was the sampling appropriate?</li> <li>Have the equipment and materials been adequately described?</li> <li>Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded; has the author been precise in describing measurements?</li> </ul>	
6. Statistical: Did statistical model and tests were appropriate for hypotheses' testing?	
7. Results: Was conducted the appropriate analysis? Is the statistics correct?	
8. Discussion/Conclusion: Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?	
9. Language: Is an article poorly written due to grammatical errors ?	
10. Previous research: Are there any important works that have been omitted? Are the references accurate?	
If substantial changes are necessary, would you like to review a revised version of the manuscript?	

Regardless of acceptability for publication, is this topic of			
High interest	Medium interest	Low interest	

## **Reviewer conclusion:**

 $\Box$  accept without changes

 $\Box$  accept after changes suggested by reviewers

 $\hfill\square$  rate manuscript once again after major changes and another review

□ reject

## **Information for Authors:**