



**LIMNOLOGICAL REVIEW**

**VOLUME** .....

**MS №:** .....

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: