
Review: Paper Title

Sed commodo posuere pede. Mauris ut est. Ut quis purus. Sed ac odio. Sed vehicula
hendrerit sem. Duis non odio. Morbi ut dui. Sed accumsan risus eget odio. In hac
habitasse platea dictumst. Pellentesque non elit. Fusce sed justo eu urna porta tincidunt.
Mauris felis odio, sollicitudin sed, volutpat a, ornare ac, erat. Morbi quis dolor. Donec
pellentesque, erat ac sagittis semper, nunc dui lobortis purus, quis congue purus metus
ultrices tellus. Proin et quam. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia
nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Praesent sapien turpis, fermentum vel, eleifend faucibus,
vehicula eu, lacus.

*small abstract
of the paper*

1.1 General

1. Is it an original/novel contribution? ((tbd))
2. Is it a significant contribution? ((tbd))
3. Is it the right amount of work for one paper? ((tbd))
4. Not too much overlap with authors' previous work? ((tbd))
5. Is the approach appropriate for the problem? ((tbd))
6. Does it consider current research? ((tbd))
7. Is the structure (see below) ok? ((tbd))
8. Is it written in correct, clear and concise English? ((tbd))
9. Are abbreviations and symbols explained? ((tbd))
10. Does it fit the scope of the journal? ((tbd))

1.2 Title

- 11. Does it reflect the content of the paper? ((tbd))
- 12. Is it specific? ((tbd))

25

1.3 Abstract

- 13. Is it informative and comprehensive? ((tbd))
- 14. Does it properly reflect the paper's content? ((tbd))
- 15. Does it mention purpose/problem, methods, results, conclusions and significance? ((tbd))
- 16. Is it brief and concise? ((tbd))

30

1.4 Introduction

- 17. Is it long enough? Is it not too long? ((tbd))
- 18. Does it fit the audience? ((tbd))
- 19. Does it cite work by others than the authors? ((tbd))
- 20. Does it motivate what follows? ((tbd))

35

1.5 Main text body

- 21. Is the approach clearly and concisely described? ((tbd))
- 22. Are there sufficient/not too many details? ((tbd))
- 23. Can others reproduce the experiment? ((tbd))
- 24. Are all parts necessary? ((tbd))

40

1.6 Conclusions

- 25. Is no new material introduced? ((tbd))
- 26. Is the focus only on the authors results? ((tbd))
- 27. Do the results support the conclusions? ((tbd))

45

1.7 References

- 28. Are recent references cited? ((tbd))
- 29. Are references by others than the authors cited? ((tbd))
- 30. Are important references cited? ((tbd))
- 50 31. Are reference details correct? ((tbd))
- 32. Do the references state what the authors claim? ((tbd))
- 33. Are all references used in the text? ((tbd))

1.8 Figures and Tables

- 34. Is each figure/table necessary? ((tbd))
- 55 35. Is a figure/table the right choice? ((tbd))
- 36. Are all captions present and appropriate? ((tbd))
- 37. Is each figure/table referenced in the text? ((tbd))
- 38. Are tables readable (clear layout, no leading zeros, only significant digits)? ((tbd))
- 60 39. Is the quality of the figures good enough (sharpness, legend present, readable fonts, axes labelled)? ((tbd))

1.9 General considerations

- 40. Review the way you want to be reviewed yourself ((tbd))
- 41. Write in a constructive, clear and explicit way ((tbd))
- 65 42. Cite where necessary to backup your critique ((tbd))
- 43. Do not enforce your own opinions/preferences ((tbd))
- 44. If more brevity or detail is needed, say where ((tbd))
- 45. If you can not assess something, e.g. significance of contribution, say so ((tbd))
- 70 46. If you suspect fraud, plagiarism or duplicate publication, tell your editor about it immediately ((tbd))

1.10 Editor review

- 47. Importance of research question ((tbd))
- 48. Originality/novelty of work ((tbd))
- 49. Appropriateness and priority for publication ((tbd))
- 50. Writing style, quality of figures/tables ((tbd))
- 51. Strengths/weaknesses of approach, data and implementation ((tbd))
- 52. Thoroughness ((tbd))
- 53. Timeliness ((tbd))
- 54. Constructive criticism backed by references ((tbd))
- 55. Objectivity ((tbd))

75

80