Journal of XYZ
2011 reviewer receipt

During 2011, the scientist using the email address b.smith@usomewhere.edu has provided 2 reviews for newly submitted articles for our journal. This is the standardized Review Quality Collector receipt for these reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Timeliness, T</th>
<th>Helpful f. Editor, E</th>
<th>Helpful f. Authors, A</th>
<th>Total grade</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The journal-specific 2011 grading system used at Journal of XYZ has the following structure:

Review timeliness (T, weight 25%):
- 100 points: less than 4 weeks
- 60 points: less than 8 weeks
- 0 points: otherwise

Review helpfulness for editor (E, weight 40%):
- Facet "trustworthiness":
  - 50 points: The review appears fully sound and trustworthy
  - 30 points: The review appears almost fully sound and trustworthy
  - 0 points: The review is partially dubious
- Facet "completeness":
  - 15 points: The review covers all important issues
  - 0 points: The review leaves at least one important issue undiscussed
- Facet "weighting":
  - 15 points: For any strength or issue mentioned, the review provides clear indication how important it is
  - 10 points: For most strengths or issues mentioned, the review provides clear indication how important it is
  - 0 points: otherwise
- Facet "balancedness":
  - 20 points: The review explicitly weighs strengths against weaknesses to arrive at its recommendation
  - 0 points: otherwise

Review helpfulness for authors (A, weight 35%):
- 100 points: For its criticism, the review provides improvement help to the authors that covers all of the criticism, is detailed, easy to understand, constructive, and is expressed in a respectful tone.
- 80 points: The help has only four of the above characteristics
- 50 points: It has only three of them
- 20 points: It has only two of them
- 0 points: otherwise

((Remark: This page is a dummy example that serves to show the principle of RQC receipts. The grading system used is not meant to be a realistic or useful one. The ranks are percentile ranks of one review among all reviews of that article type in that year in that journal. 0% is best, 100% is worst.))