



LIMNOLOGICAL REVIEW

LIMNOLOGICAL REVIEW VOLUME, MS №:

Author/Authors:

Title MS:

EVALUATION

1. TITLE

- acceptable
- should be changed

2. ABSTRACT

- clear
- should be partly rewritten
- should be completely rewritten

3. INFORMATION IN MS

- original, new
- widening of knowledge
- repetition of known facts
- should preferably be submitted to
.....

4. SCIENTIFIC VALUE OF MS

- high
- sufficient
- insufficient

5. NUMBER OF MATERIALS

- high
- adequate
- scanty

6. METHODS

- original
- adequate
- inappropriate or deficient

7. CONCLUSIONS BASED ON RESULTS

- entirely
- partially
- insufficiently

8. NUMBER OF REFERENCES

- appropriate
- inappropriate
- too many

9. RELATION BETWEEN SCIENTIFIC VALUE AND EXTENT OF MS

- adequate
- inadequate

10. TABLES (number, extent)

- adequate
- inadequate
- inappropriate data presentation

11. ILLUSTRATIONS

- adequate
- excessive
- duplicity with tables
- low quality

12. LANGUAGE

- acceptable
- should be revised

13. STYLE

- acceptable
- too brief
- too wordy
- poorly arranged
- does not follow instructions to authors

14. MS IS GRADED AS

- excellent
- good
- acceptable after revision; does not require re-review
- acceptable only if substantially revised; require re-review
- reject because too weak, speculative, preliminary, is outside the scope of the journal or for other reasons

Critical comments and recommendations to MS (you can also use separate sheet)

Confidential communication to Editorial Board

Date: