**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. | |