Components	Questions	Author Checklist	Author Notes Reviewe	r t Reviewer Notes
Project Organization	Is my folder structure logical?			
	Are raw data, code, and intermediate outputs separated?			
	Does file and folder naming complement the workflow (e.g., label subfolders/files numerically to show the order things should be run)			
Project and input metadata	Can someone understand (and access) the workflow and content of the analysis?			
	Is a README provided to explain data contents, licensing, and curation?			
	Does the README make it clear how to run the analysis?			
	Does the README list the authors and project title?			
Code Readability	Is my code understandable? Consider clear subheadings, intuitive coding comments, easy-to-understand object names			
	Is the documentation appropriate for the audience?			
	If an analysis step would take a long time to run on a personal computer, is that documented?			
	Have extraneous packages and analysis code been removed?			
	Is external package use clearly documented?			
Output Reproducibility	Can the results be reproduced? If exact results cannot be reproduced (e.g., due to randomization), what is the magnitude of difference?			
	Are all components required to recreate analysis and figures accessible? If data are confidential or the dataset is too large to share, are sample/aggregated data provided to ensure that code functions correctly?			
	Have you done tests to ensure that the code functions appropriately? If so, describe what tests			
This spreadsheet was informed by and modified from lvimey-Cook et al 2023. Implementing code review in the scientific workflow: Insights from ecology and evolutionary biology. <u>https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.</u> 1111/jeb.14230				