

### Peer Review

Your appraisal should offer an objective, critical evaluation of the manuscript within a broad conceptual framework. While detailed commentary on stylistic nuances is not mandatory, should you identify significant linguistic deficiencies, please respond affirmatively to the subsequent inquiry regarding whether the manuscript requires formal grammatical revision.

### 1. Overview (Please rate each item by checking the appropriate box)

<p><b>Overall appreciation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the paper easy to read and free from grammatical or spelling errors?</li> <li>▪ Is this paper based on rigorous academic standards?</li> <li>▪ Is the content of this paper technically accurate and sound?</li> </ul> <p><b>Title and Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do the title and abstract cover the main aspects of the work?</li> <li>▪ Is the abstract concise and sufficient?</li> </ul> <p><b>Aims</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the study aims clearly stated and logical?</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the introduction provide the necessary background information?</li> </ul> <p><b>Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the experiment could be reproduced?</li> <li>▪ Is the statistical analysis appropriate to the research question and study design?</li> </ul> <p><b>Results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the study provide an advance in the field?</li> <li>▪ Are the results of analysis correctly interpreted?</li> </ul> <p><b>Figures and Tables</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are figures and tables well-constructed, legible, and of sufficiently high resolution (i.e., not blurry)?</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the discussion section critical and comprehensive?</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the conclusions drawn supported by the data and correlate to the results found?</li> </ul> <p><b>References</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the references appropriate in number and up-to-date?</li> <li>▪ Do the references follow the journal instructions?</li> </ul>	
--	--

### 2. General assessment (Please rate each item by checking the appropriate box)

A. In general, how do you rate the degree to which the paper is easy to follow and its logical flow?

Excellent      Good      Fair      Poor

**B. Do you think the manuscript requires English editing to correct the grammar or flow?**

Yes      No

- There is NO requirement to comment specifically on matters of style but if you feel there are major issues please click 'Yes' to the following questions asking if the manuscript requires its English grammar to be corrected.
- **Please Note:** Manuscripts will be edited following acceptance and prior to publication, and this includes general improvements to the quality of English. 'Yes' should only be selected where the amount of English language revision required is very significant.

**C. Comments to the authors**

**Major Revision comments**

**Minor Revision comments**

**Optional / General comments**

3. Ethical consideration and competing interest (Please rate each item by checking the appropriate box)

- Did the study gain ethical approval appropriate to the country in which the research was performed if human or animal subjects, human cell lines or human tissues were involved and is it stated in the manuscript?

Yes      No

- Does the paper raise any ethical concerns?

Yes      No

4. Recommendations to the Editor (Please rate each item by checking the appropriate box)

- **Outstanding** - Paper is well written and a significant contribution to the literature. No improvement needed.
- **Excellent** - Accept after discretionary revisions.
- **Very good** - Some minor revisions needed.
- **Good** - Several minor revisions needed.
- **Satisfactory** - Paper requires multiple minor revisions, but I commend this paper to the Editor-in-Chief.
- **Fair** - One major revision and several minor revisions needed.
- **Poor** - Some major revisions needed with multiple minor revisions required.
- **Very poor** - Major revisions needed to improve scientific validity and/or clarity.
- **Flawed** - The manuscript has major flaws that cannot be improved with revisions. Rejection without option to resubmit recommended.

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes      No

\*\*\*\*\*

I have no relevant financial interests or conflicts related to this manuscript.

I certify that all my affiliations or financial involvement with any organization or entity having a financial interest in or conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript have been disclosed.

NB: "Financial involvement" includes: Employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, royalties.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

#### Declaration

Details of relevant conflicts of interests must be declared in the "Conflicts of Interest" box when submitting your peer review comments.

#### Disqualification

If you feel your conflicts of interest prevent you from conducting an unbiased review, you should disqualify yourself from reviewing the manuscript and inform the editorial office of this fact.

### **Confidentiality clause**

All papers submitted to The NAJFNR are to be kept confidential. Peer-reviewers, Editors-in-Chief, Section-Editors, Co-Editors, Review-Editors, and the NAJFNR staff should not disclose, discuss, or provide any part or aspect of such papers until such time as they are published. Rejected papers may not be discussed, disclosed or provided to any third parties. By acting as an invited reviewer, Associate Editor or Co-Editor you agree to be bound by these restrictions.

### **Display my name in the 2026 peer reviewer list**

Yes      No