



REVIEW FORM 2026

Peer review (double-blind)

To ensure the originality of the study and data protection, the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools **is NOT permitted** for conducting or improving the evaluations.

If you believe the study has fundamental flaws, please recommend rejection, explaining why the manuscript does not meet the requirements for publication.

When describing your review report in the comments to the authors, it is essential that you present your reasoning in a courteous and professional manner.

Request a review only when the manuscript shows potential for publication; it is advisable to write a constructive report, as your feedback is essential to ensuring the future soundness of the research.

Please note: Comments added for the editor are confidential and will not be shared with the author.

Please limit your comments to:

- Ethical issues related to experiments or considerations; concerns regarding any disclosed conflicts of interest;
- Concerns regarding plagiarism or publication ethics;
- Any additional comments that will help the Editor evaluate the revisions you have requested.

1) Does the title of this article reflect its content and accurately describe the type of study? *

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

2) Do the “What is already known” and “What this article adds” highlights accurately reflect the article’s content? Are they each organized into three topics? *

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

3) Are the descriptors representative of the topic addressed, and are they included in DeCS/MeSH? *

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

4) Does the abstract adequately reflect the content of the article? *

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

5) Is the introduction appropriate for addressing the knowledge gap and contributing to the advancement of science? *

- ☐ Yes
☐ Partially, although the text provided could be improved with revision
☐ No, because there are inconsistent issues that cannot be addressed



6) Is the method appropriate for achieving the proposed objective? Is it described in a way that is clear enough to allow the study to be replicated? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partially, although the text provided could be improved with revision
- ☐ No, because there are inconsistent issues that cannot be addressed

7) Are the ethical aspects presented in accordance with the guidelines for conducting research involving human subjects (research ethics committee approval number, informed consent form, identification/confidentiality codes, etc.)? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not applicable

8) Were the results reported accurately? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partially, although the text provided could be improved with revision
- ☐ No, because there are inconsistent issues that cannot be addressed

9) Is the use of statistics appropriate? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I can't evaluate that
- ☐ Not relevant to this manuscript

10) Do the analyses include interpretations and discussions grounded in theoretical frameworks? Do they draw on relevant and up-to-date literature? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partially, although the text provided could be improved with revision
- ☐ No, because there are inconsistent issues that cannot be addressed

11) Does it present the limitations and recommendations for practice at the end of the Discussion? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partially, although the text provided could be improved with revision
- ☐ No, because there are inconsistent issues that cannot be addressed

12) Are the conclusions objective, do they address the objective, and are they supported by the evidence presented? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partially, although the text provided could be improved with revision
- ☐ No, because there are inconsistent issues that cannot be addressed



13) Are the images/illustrations free from any apparent manipulation? Are they illustrative? Are they consistent? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ I can't evaluate that
- ☐ Not applicable

14) Are the figures/tables/charts necessary and well-designed? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not applicable to this study

15) Are at least 70% of the references from the last five years and are they predominantly scientific articles? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

16) Indicate the priority level for publication (1 = lowest priority to 10 = highest priority) *

Based on this quantitative and qualitative assessment, make your decision and prepare your substantiated qualitative opinion.

- ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

17) Evaluation decision: *

- ☐ Accept
- ☐ Minor revisions (the manuscript requires linguistic corrections or re-editing; constructive suggestions are needed to prepare the manuscript for acceptance—without requiring multiple rounds of revision).
- ☐ Major revisions (issues such as the need to broaden the scope of the problem in the introduction, data analysis, superficial discussion, and vague conclusion).
- ☐ Reject (inappropriate for publication, violates ethical principles, contains inconsistencies and incoherence, does not contribute to the advancement and dissemination of science) *If it is determined that this is a resubmission, reject it for resubmission.

18) Feedback for the authors (Your qualitative assessment is very important in helping the authors) *



** All questions are mandatory.*