**sjar Guidelines for reviewers**

**Manuscript title:**

**Manuscript ref.:**

These guidelines are meant to assist you to fill in the attached “reviewer list” and to formulate your detailed comments on a separate sheet. Your comments will assist the author(s) when revising the manuscript.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of article |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Review
 |  |
| * Article
 |  |
| * Short communication
 |  |

 |
| 1. Importance of the science (originality and relevance): 1-unimportant, 5-very important: |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

 |
| 2. Quality of the science (valid research methods and statistical analysis)  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Major flaws
 |  |
| * Minor flaws
 |  |
| * Correctable flaws
 |  |
| * Competent State-of-the-art
 |  |

 |
| 3. Regional scope of interest |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Local to one country | Local to one climatic region | Broad interest | Worldwide |
|  |  |  |  |

 |
| 4. Description of methods |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Not enough detail to assess the quality of the experiment
 |  |
| * Description contains contradictions or errors
 |  |
| * Description needs improvement
 |  |
| * Satisfactory
 |  |

 |
| 5. Coverage of relevant literature |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Most key papers missing
 |  |
| * Several key papers missing
 |  |
| * A few key papers missing
 |  |
| * No key papers missing
 |  |

 |
| 6. Discussion |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * No new ideas, mostly repetition of results
 |  |
| * Comparison to earlier results, some new ideas but without good argumentation
 |  |
| * Well developed, new ideas with good argumentation
 |  |
| * Very good, well developed new ideas and a good presentation of the importance of the new findings
 |  |

 |
| 7. English language |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * No opinion
 |  |
| * Must be rewritten
 |  |
| * Must be language checked by a professional language editor or native speaker
 |  |
| * Edit text as suggested
 |  |
| * Satisfactory
 |  |

 |
| 8. Overall rating of the manuscript: 1-very bad, 5-excellent\* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

 |
| 9. Recommendation |

|  |
| --- |
| * Accepted
 |
| * Minor Revision
 |
| * Major Review
 |
| * Rejected
 |

 |
| 10. Merits. (Maximum 1000 words. Your appraisal of which are the strong points of the manuscript. Why and how the subject area of the paper is important or not) |
| 11. Critique. (Maximum 1000 words. Your appraisal of which are the flaws and downsides of the manuscript. Include in your assessment of the use of technical terms and quality of the English.) |
| 12. Free form comments to authors (e.g. suggestions of changes to the text.) |
| 13. Confidential comments to editor, including suspicions about plagiarism, republication, etc. |