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.

#	Timeli-ness, T	Helpful f. Editor, E	Helpful f. Authors, A	Total grade	Rank
1	100	75	80	83	12%
2	60	95	80	81	15%

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