Sample comments

Please note that these are just examples of how you might provide feedback on an author’s work. You should, of course, always tailor your review to the paper in question and the specific requirements of the journal and the editor.

Positive comments

- The manuscript is well written in an engaging and lively style.
- The level is appropriate to our readership.
- The subject is very important. It’s currently something of a “hot topic”, and is one to which the author has made significant contributions.
- This manuscript ticks all the boxes we have in mind for an (type) paper. I have no hesitation in recommending that it be accepted for publication after a few typos and other minor details have been attended to.
- Given the complexity involved, the author has produced many positive and welcome outcomes. The literature review offers a useful overview of current research and policy, and the resulting bibliography provides a very useful resource for current practitioners.
- This is a well-written article that identifies an important gap.

Constructive criticism

- In the “Discussion” section I would have wished to see more information on...
- I don’t think that this article contains enough robust data to evidence the statement made on page X, lines Y–Z.
- I would strongly advise the author to rewrite their introduction, analysis, and discussion to produce a more contextualized introduction to...
- There is an interesting finding in this research about.... However, there is insufficient discussion of exactly what this finding means and its implications.
- This discussion could be expanded to explain...
- The author could strengthen the paper by...
- The paper would be significantly improved with the addition of more details about...
- The abstract is very lengthy and goes into detailed accounts that are best suited for the article’s main discussion sections. As such, I suggest the author reduces this section to keep only the most important elements.
- To make this paper publishable, the author needs to respond to the following substantive points...

Linguistic alterations

- This paper would benefit from some closer proofreading. It includes many linguistic errors (e.g. agreement of verbs) that at times make it difficult to follow. It may be useful to engage a professional English language editor following a restructure of the paper.
- The paper would benefit from stylistic changes to the way it has been written for a stronger, clearer, and more compelling argument.
- There are a few sentences that need rephrasing for clarity.
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