

Traffic Safety Research (TSR) peer review form

First review round

The review consists of three parts:

1. You are asked to rate some aspects of the manuscript identified as important for the journal publications' profile.
2. Free-text review addressing more specifically the strong and weak aspects of the manuscript. Some comments may be provided visible to the editor only—but do not overuse this option.
3. Finally, you choose a recommendation to the editor on how to proceed with the manuscript:
 - **Accept Submission.** The manuscript has now relevant contents and the quality high enough to be published in the journal.
 - **Revisions Required.** The manuscript still requires some *minor* changes, but you trust the authors and the editor to solve this without initiating another round of reviewing.
 - **Resubmit for Review.** The manuscript requires *major* changes and additional round of reviewing is necessary to make sure it has been sufficiently improved.
 - **Resubmit Elsewhere.** The manuscript has some potential for publication, but its scope/quality does not match the expectations of the *TSR* journal. The authors should try submitting their work elsewhere.
 - **Decline Submission.** The scope/quality of the submitted work is a way beyond the expectations of the *TSR* journal and the situation is not likely to improve after a revision.
 - **See Comments.** Use this option if you cannot decide on the recommendation—but make sure to explain yourself in the comments to the editor.

Problem formulation (not visible to authors)

*obligatory

Is it clear what the problem the authors are attempting to address? Is it a relevant problem? Have the authors put the problem in the context of already existing knowledge and works done by others?

- 1 (poor)
- 2
- 3 (neutral)
- 4
- 5 (strong)

Method choice and description (not visible to authors)

*obligatory

Are the methods used properly described to a degree that they can be understood and, if necessary, replicated? Is the choice of the methods appropriate for the problem at hand? In case the authors use advanced mathematical tools, is it done only to a degree required to address the relevant traffic safety problem rather than becoming a goal in itself?

- 1 (poor)
- 2
- 3 (neutral)
- 4
- 5 (strong)

Practical value of results (not visible to authors)

*obligatory

Does this work provide practically usable knowledge rather than being ‘an exercise’ done for the sake of an extra publication? Obviously, not all valuable results come in ready-to-implement shape; however, if this work is published, will we be better equipped (with understanding, knowledge, or tools) for saving lives in traffic?

- 1 (poor)
- 2
- 3 (neutral)
- 4
- 5 (strong)

Safe System/Vision Zero relevance (not visible to authors)

*obligatory

Is this work in line with the Safe System way of thinking? Are the stated problem(s)/suggested solution(s) put in the context of the priorities and principles set by the Safe System (e.g. focus on prevention of fatalities/serious injuries rather than ‘all accidents’, acknowledgement of responsibility by system designers, human body fragility and safe speed as fundamental parameters defining the traffic system properties, etc.)?

- 1 (poor)
- 2
- 3 (neutral)
- 4
- 5 (strong)

Comments to authors

*obligatory

Recommended structure:

- Start with a *general overview* of whether the paper addresses a relevant research question and makes a valuable contribution to the current bulk of knowledge on traffic safety.
- Add some *major comments* with regards to the choice and application of the method, data and data analysis quality, soundness of the discussion and conclusions.
- Conclude with *minor comments* related to the language use, errors in the text, graphs and tables, etc.

Potential for improvement (not visible to authors)

*obligatory

What is your opinion on the likelihood that the manuscript will ever reach the quality standard expected by the *Traffic Safety Research* journal? We ask this question to avoid a long and tiresome sequence of reviews without any substantial improvements taking place.

- 1 (poor)
- 2
- 3 (neutral)
- 4
- 5 (strong)

Comments to editor (not visible to authors)

Here you can add comments that will be seen by the editor only. Please, keep in mind that most of the feedback should be put in the text that the authors *will* see. Confidential comments should not be a place for denigration or false accusation, done in the knowledge that the authors will not see them.

Consequent review round

Please, follow up with the authors on how they addressed your comments and on the general status of the revised manuscript. As usual, provide a recommendation to the editor on how to proceed:

- **Accept Submission.** The manuscript has now relevant contents and the quality high enough to be published in the journal.
- **Revisions Required.** The manuscript still requires some *minor* changes, but you trust the authors and the editor to solve this without initiating another round of reviewing.
- **Resubmit for Review.** The manuscript requires *major* changes and additional round of reviewing is necessary to make sure it has been sufficiently improved.
- **Resubmit Elsewhere.** The manuscript has some potential for publication, but its scope/quality does not match the expectations of the *TSR* journal. The authors should try submitting their work elsewhere.
- **Decline Submission.** The scope/quality of the submitted work is a way beyond the expectations of the *TSR* journal and the situation is not likely to improve after a revision.
- **See Comments.** Use this option if you cannot decide on the recommendation—but make sure to explain yourself in the comments to the editor.

Comments to authors

*obligatory

Potential for improvement (not visible to authors)

*obligatory

Based on the response from the authors and the changes provided by them so far, what is your opinion on the likelihood that the manuscript will ever reach the quality standard expected by the *Traffic Safety Research* journal? We ask this question to avoid a long and tiresome sequence of reviews without any substantial improvements taking place.

- 1 (poor)
- 2
- 3 (neutral)
- 4
- 5 (strong)

Comments to editor (not visible to authors)

Here you can add comments that will be seen by the editor only. Please, keep in mind that most of the feedback should be put in the text that the authors will see. Confidential comments should not be a place for denigration or false accusation, done in the knowledge that the authors will not see them.