Rubric for determining editing level

	Poor (1)	Mediocre (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Oral Proficiency	Can speak only simplest sentences with very simple vocabulary and still highly error-prone	Functional but frequent awkward and unnatural phrases and errors	Usually readily understood by native speakers, still some awkwardness and technical errors	Generally easy to understand by native speakers, but infrequent errors or non- native usage	• Native or nearly so
Written proficiency	Difficulty producing clear, appropriate wording without help, common unnatural phrasing and technical errors	Functional but frequent awkward and unnatural phrases and technical errors	Usually readily understood, some awkwardness and/or technical errors	Generally easy to understand, but may have a few technical errors	• Native or nearly so
Writing experience	No prior peer-reviewed publications as first/corresponding author none or few as contributing author	1 prior peer- reviewed publication as first/corresponding author few to many as contributing author	2-3 articles written and published as first/corresponding author	4-5 articles written and published as first/corresponding author	6 or more articles written and published as first/corresponding Author
Logical communication (independent of English fluency)	Don't know if the organization of ideas within sentences, within paragraphs, and within sections is clear and logical I know it is poor	Organization of ideas within sentences, paragraphs, and sections needs considerable work	Organization of ideas within sentences, paragraphs, and sections is just OK or so-so	Fairly confident that the organization of ideas within sentences, paragraphs, and sections is mostly clear and logical	Certain that the organization of ideas is clear and logical throughout a whole manuscript
Document organization	Don't know whether I write in accordance with proper scientific organization Know that my papers would benefit from reorganization	Sometimes/often have trouble meeting word length restrictions and/or question where in papers to put some aspects of the information	Generally know what information belongs where, but have never formally learned about proper scientific paper organization	Generally know what information belongs in which section Believe I include all necessary information and do not repeat ideas unnecessarily	Certain that I know what information belongs in which section Confident that I include all necessary information and do not repeat ideas know 'IMR(a)D' format
Familiarity with scientific format and style	No previous experience with scientific style & formatting	Don't know if I use correct style and formatting (or I know I don't)	Have some idea of correct style and formatting but not certain how to apply it consistently	Probably use correct style and formatting in accordance with publishers' expectations	Confident that I use correct style and formatting in accordance with publishers' expectations
Proficiency with table and figure making	The editor should improve the organization and/or formatting of my tables, and also improve my figures for me	• The editor should improve the organization/ and/or formatting of my tables, and also advise me on how to improve my figures myself	The editor should improve the organization and/or formatting of my figures/tables, but my tables/figures are fine as is	I think make good enough tables and figures The editor should not spend time on them	All tables and figures are properly formatted and conform to established publication standards

Total score/recommended editing level:

7–14: Elite 14–21: Advanced 21–28: Regular 28–35: Light