



Reviewer Evaluation Form

Double-anonymised peer review. Please complete all sections, tick the boxes that apply and return the form to the Editorial Office.

Confidentiality. The manuscript is a confidential document. Do not share it, use its content or upload it, in whole or in part, to any external or generative AI system. Sections 1–7 are for the editors only; only Section 8 is forwarded to the authors, without your identity.

1 MANUSCRIPT

Manuscript ID	[EJSS-YYYY-XXXX]
Manuscript title	[Title as given in the invitation]
Review round	☐ First review ☐ Revised version
Date returned	[DD Month YYYY]

2 REVIEWER DECLARATION

- ☐ I have no conflict of interest with this manuscript or, as far as I can tell, its authors.
- ☐ I have a potential conflict of interest, described in Section 7.
- ☐ I will keep the manuscript and this review confidential and will not upload any part of it to an AI system.
- ☐ If I believe I know the identity of the authors, I have informed the editor in Section 7.

3 GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Scope	☐ Within the scope of EJSS ☐ Outside the scope of EJSS
Originality	☐ No similar work known to me ☐ Similar work published by others ☐ Overlaps with earlier work, possibly by the same authors (explain in Section 7)

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality and novelty	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scientific and technical quality	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clarity of presentation	☐	☐	☐	☐
Significance for soil science	☐	☐	☐	☐

4 SPECIFIC EVALUATION

Title, abstract and keywords	Yes	No	N/A
Does the title accurately reflect the content?	☐	☐	☐
Is the abstract understandable without reading the manuscript?	☐	☐	☐
Does the abstract summarise the main results without omitting important findings or overstating them?	☐	☐	☐
Are the keywords appropriate?	☐	☐	☐
Introduction	Yes	No	N/A
Is the topic relevant to soil science and scientifically important?	☐	☐	☐
Is previous work adequately reviewed and cited?	☐	☐	☐
Are the objectives or hypotheses clearly stated?	☐	☐	☐
Materials and methods	Yes	No	N/A
Are the methods clearly described, with no ambiguity or missing information?	☐	☐	☐
Are the methods and experimental design appropriate for the objectives?	☐	☐	☐
Is the statistical analysis appropriate and adequately reported?	☐	☐	☐
Is there enough detail for the work to be reproduced?	☐	☐	☐
Results	Yes	No	N/A
Are the results presented clearly and in a logical order?	☐	☐	☐
Are the results supported by the data and statistical analysis?	☐	☐	☐
Are the same data not duplicated in tables and figures?	☐	☐	☐
Discussion and conclusion	Yes	No	N/A
Are the results interpreted in the context of the relevant literature?	☐	☐	☐
Are the arguments appropriate and not overstated?	☐	☐	☐
Are the limitations of the study acknowledged in the Discussion?	☐	☐	☐
Are the conclusions justified by the results?	☐	☐	☐
Tables and figures	Yes	No	N/A
Are all tables and figures necessary, with none missing?	☐	☐	☐
Are they clear, and are the captions self-explanatory?	☐	☐	☐
References	Yes	No	N/A
Are the key and recent references included, without excessive or inappropriate citation?	☐	☐	☐



Do the in-text citations and the reference list follow the EJSS style?	☐	☐	☐
Units, abbreviations and nomenclature	Yes	No	N/A
Are SI units used correctly and all abbreviations defined?	☐	☐	☐
Are soil classification and scientific names given correctly?	☐	☐	☐

Language	☐ Acceptable	☐ Minor editing needed	☐ Major editing needed
-----------------	-------------------------------------	---	---

5 RESEARCH INTEGRITY

- ☐ I have no research-integrity concerns.
- ☐ I have concerns about (tick all that apply and explain in Section 7):
- ☐ plagiarism, text recycling or duplicate publication
 - ☐ fabrication or manipulation of data, figures or images, including AI-generated content
 - ☐ ethics approval, permits or consent
 - ☐ inappropriate or excessive self-citation

6 RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation	☐ Accept ☐ Minor revision ☐ Major revision ☐ Reject
Review the revised version?	☐ Yes ☐ No

7 CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR

Not forwarded to the authors.

[Your overall view for the editor, any conflict of interest, research-integrity concerns or other confidential remarks.]



8 COMMENTS TO THE AUTHORS

Forwarded to the authors without your identity. Do not include your name or any information that could identify you.

[Start with a short summary of the manuscript and its main contribution. Then list numbered comments, giving the line number for each (e.g., "1. Lines 112–118: ..."), separating major issues from minor issues. Be specific, constructive and courteous.]

Reviewer information — for the editors only

Name	<i>[First name Family name]</i>
Institution	<i>[Institution, Country]</i>
ORCID iD <i>optional</i>	<i>[https://orcid.org/0000-0000-0000-0000]</i>