## STUDIA QUATERNARIA

sq

## An Interdisciplinary Journal on Quaternary Research

Issued by Polish Academy of Sciences
Committee for Quaternary Research and Institute of Geological Sciences

Twarda 51/55, 00-818 Warsaw, Poland; http://www.studia.quaternaria.pan.pl; sq@twarda.pan.pl

## Manuscript evaluation form

- \* To provide the author(s) with the means to improve the manuscript, please comment objectively.
- \* Please document statements adequately.
- \* If a paper repeats previously published work please point this out.
- \* We aim to publish papers that are of broad, generic interest, and would welcome your view as to whether this manuscript would appeal to a wide audience.
- \* Please tick your answers

## We would be pleased to receive your review within 4 weeks but if you cannot do it, inform us about it as soon as possible, please

| Manuscript no. Author(s):   |            |
|---|------------|
| Title:  |            |
| 1. Is the subject suitable for <b>Studia Quaternaria</b> ?                      | Yes □ No □ |
| 2. Scientific importance of paper   |            |
| - Broad international interest  | Yes □ No □ |
| - Local interest  | Yes □ No □ |
| - Strictly specialized in content   | Yes □ No □ |
| - Useful paper that lacks originality   | Yes □ No □ |
| - A new and useful synthesis of previous data                                   | Yes □ No □ |
| 3. Is this paper  |            |
| - properly organised?   | Yes □ No □ |
| - written clearly using correct grammar and syntax?                             | Yes □ No □ |
| 4. Is the title informative and a reflection of the content?                    | Yes □ No □ |
| 5. Are the methods used adequately described?                                   | Yes □ No □ |
| 6. Is the abstract concise and meaningful?                                      | Yes □ No □ |
| 7. Are the interpretations/conclusions justified by the data?                   | Yes □ No □ |
| 8. Are the organization and length of the paper satisfactory?                   | Yes □ No □ |
| 9. Is the presentation clear enough for an international, interdisciplinary au- | dience?    |
|   | Yes □ No □ |
| 10. Are all the tables and figures necessary?                                   | Yes □ No □ |
| If not, which?  |            |
| 11. Are the diagrams and photographs of good quality?                           | Yes □ No □ |
| 12. Are there essential figures that should be prepared?                        | Yes □ No □ |
| If yes, please detail   |            |
| 13. Is the referencing relevant and up to date?                                 | Yes □ No □ |
| 14. Are the keywords appropriate and complete?                                  | Yes □ No □ |
| 15. Does the manuscript require improvement of written language?                | Yes □ No □ |

| 16. Would you suggest any improvements or any parts which could be shortened or remove <i>If yes, please detail</i>   | ed?                  | Yes □ No □                   |
|---|----------------------|------------------------------|
| <ul> <li>17. OVERALL EVALUATION (tick one)</li> <li>- Acceptable as it stands</li> <li>- Acceptable after minor revision</li> <li>- Possibly acceptable after major revision</li> <li>- Unacceptable</li> </ul> |                      |                              |
| Please explain the reasons for your answers and give<br>sheets; you may of course also provide, keying your<br>manuscript.  |                      | -                            |
| If you have recommended major revision, would you manuscript?   | u be willing to revi | ew the revised<br>Yes □ No □ |
| Do you wish to be identified to the authors?  |                      | Yes □ No □                   |
| Thank you. Your co-operation  | is much apprecia     | ted.                         |
| Date: Name:   |                      |                              |
| Additional comments:  |                      |                              |