

Peer Review

Review of: "Model Contribution Rate Theory: An Empirical Examination"

Heitor Costa¹

1. Universidade Federal de Lavras, Brazil

- Dear Authors, your work is too relevant. My observations (questions) aim to improve Readers' understanding of the idea. Thus, their answers must be in the next article version, and they must also be present in the response letter.
- The Authors must include one paragraph explaining the other sections at the end of the "Introduction" section.
- The Authors should explicitly inform the Readers of the research question. What do the Authors intend to answer by performing the presented research in the paper?
- More than presenting related work is required. The Authors did not show the relationship between their work and the state of the art (literature). They need to put a paragraph to show that differential. The Readers do not know the difference between the Authors' scientific contributions and related work. The Readers need to know how the Authors' work "advances" the research frontier. Why must the Readers use their work instead of existing work in the literature?
- Whether section 3.3.1 exists, then section 3.3.2 must exist, at least. The Authors must restructure Section 3.3.
- The Authors did not cite Figure 1, Figure 2, Table 4, Figure 3, Figure 4, Table 5, Figure 5, Figure 6, and Table 6.
- The Authors presented one section to address threats to validity. However, they could organize it into External, Internal, Conclusion, and Construct. Conclusion Validity: concerned with the relationship between treatment and outcome. Internal Validity: there is a causal relationship between treatment and outcome. Construct Validity: concerned with the relationship between theory and observation. External Validity: there is a causal relationship between cause and effect. It is relevant to

highlight that limitations are not threats to validity.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.