

## **REVIEWERS**

### **Your contribution**

We greatly appreciate the time and effort given by reviewers in evaluating papers for publication in our journal. Thanks to your contribution, *Proceedings of the Latvian Academy of Sciences* authors receive fast, fair and comprehensive review.

Our reviewers are kindly requested to deliver reports in 3-4 weeks. Whenever submission qualifies for publication but needs revision, reviewers are asked to give comprehensive opinion on necessary improvements.

### **General expectations**

While preparing the reports, we ask our reviewers to:

- comment on the originality of presented work, how it presents in most recent literature on a topic discussed,
- evaluate authors' approach to discussed problem,
- evaluate reliability of obtained results and correctness of withdrawn conclusions,
- comment on artistic and technical aspects of paper,
- give the final evaluation of paper, inform us whether we should consider it further and what should be done in order to make it publishable (if it is possible),
- give us an idea of possible impact that the paper might have.

Please note that accepted papers will undergo language editing by native English speakers. Incorrect grammar, style or punctuation should not be the reason to reject a paper if its content warrants the publication from the scientific point of view and is readable for the Reviewer.

### **Review form**

Please fill in the following form and send it back via e-mail to the Managing Editor, Mrs. Antra Legzdina, at [proceed@lza.lv](mailto:proceed@lza.lv)

## REFERENCE

To the article submitted for publication

Referee:

Date:

Author(s):

Title:

Please fill in (+ or -)

1. Is the article

- an original work

- review

- short communication

2. Does the subject and content of the paper correspond to our journal's profile?

3. Is the article scientifically valuable, written on an adequate scientific level?

4. Do the title, abstract, and key words adequately reflect the essence of the paper?

- title

- abstract

- key words

5. Do the data included form an adequate basis for the conclusions provided by the author?

6. Are there factual or interpretation mistakes?

7. Does the article contain ambiguities?

8. Does the article contain redundant material?

9. Are the citations referred to previous works adequate?

10. Is the English language used on an adequate level?

Please give more detailed comments, if necessary, on a separate page.

## Recommendations

1. To publish: Yes

- In the form submitted

- With minor corrections

- With substantial corrections

2. Not to publish

3. To send to other journal