

REFEREE'S COMMENTS ON A RESEARCH PAPER

Please tick the boxes which best describe your reaction to the paper; extra detail can be written on the right of the form, on the reverse, or prepare a separate report if you prefer.

Paper  
Reference

1. ORIGINALITY

- Never been done before.
- Never been done this way before.
- Minor variation on a known technique. Reference?
- Re-invention of a known technique. Reference?

2. SIGNIFICANCE

- Important problem  of current interest.
- Part of a problem  of current interest.
- An interesting insight.
- Recreational.

3. SOUNDNESS

- Obviously sound.
- Probably sound.
- Contains errors of detail. What sort?
- Seriously flawed. Where?

4. DETAIL

- Unnecessarily detailed. Where?
- Enough for a graduate student to repeat the work.
- Enough for the referee to repeat the work.
- No-one could repeat the work. What's missing?

5. REFERENCES

- Too many background references of marginal value
- Virtually the same references the referee would have cited.
- Out-of-date references: to old work only.
- Shallow references: to new work only.
- Totally inadequate references. What should be cited?

6. COMPREHENSIBILITY

- Understood at first reading.
- Several readings required.
- It would take a week to understand this paper.

7. PRESENTATION

- Paper is too long. Where?
- Paper is well-balanced.
- Paper is too short. What's missing?
- Rearrangement needed. How?
- Title not descriptive. What should it be?
- Abstract not descriptive. What's wrong?
- Poor figures. What's wrong?

8. RECOMMENDATION

- Accept as is.
- Minor revision:  of content;  of presentation.
- Major revision:  of content;  of presentation.  
What MUST be done before acceptance?
- Reject. Main reason is?

REFEREE Ramana Kumar ..... SIGNED ..... DATE .....