

Guidelines for Manuscript Review

Category	Rating	Description
Journalistic Criteria		
Appropriateness	Excellent	The paper is an excellent example of the type of research that should appear in this journal.
	Good	Appropriate for this journal.
	Satisfactory	This paper could probably be published in other journals that might be just as appropriate.
	Marginal	I'm not sure this should be in this journal.
Quality of Writing	Poor	This paper is totally inappropriate for this journal within the widest stretch of the imagination. It really belongs in another journal.
	Excellent	Highly readable. Well written and easy to read.
	Good	Readable.
	Satisfactory	Readable. However, the writing could be improved to help the reader understand what the author is describing.
Organization and Clarity	Marginal	Difficult to read. Needs rewriting to make the point of the paper clear.
	Poor	Impossible to read. Should be rejected on the basis of writing alone.
	Excellent	A well-structured exposition of the material that is easy to understand.
	Good	The paper is organized and clear. No real problems.
Length relative to substance.	Satisfactory	There are concepts or results that are unclear or the organization of the paper needs revision.
	Marginal	Both the organization of the paper and its clarity are poor and need to be revised to be acceptable.
	Poor	Haphazard organization and unclear concepts make this paper impossible to understand. Reject and suggest a complete rewriting.
	Excellent	The paper is sufficiently long enough to describe the research, but is not wordy.
References to the literature	Good	The length of the paper is reasonable. It could be improved somewhat
	Satisfactory	The paper is too wordy and needs to be cut to be effective.
	Marginal	There are insufficient details for this to be considered an accurate description of the research.
	Poor	This paper is either too long and needs to be cut drastically or too short to be of any use. It should be rejected and resubmitted as a new paper.
References to the literature	Excellent	A strong, comprehensive reference list. Can't be improved upon.
	Good	Good reference list.
	Satisfactory	Weak reference list. Needs additional papers to be complete.
	Marginal	Poor reference list. There are insufficient papers to support the current research.

	Poor	The reference list is missing major papers that are required to place the current research in a correct context.
Relevance of Figures	Excellent	Excellent graphics that illuminate the text.
	Good	The graphics are appropriate to the text and its contents.
	Satisfactory	The figures could use revision to increase comprehension or readability
	Marginal	The figures are poorly drawn and will require revision to be useful.
	Poor	Lacks figures to make the text comprehensible. Or the figures are so poorly drawn as to be useless.
Scientific Merit		
Originality	Excellent	Novel contribution of fundamental importance.
	Good	New work. I know of no comparable effort.
	Satisfactory	Derivative work, but provides new results.
	Marginal	This paper is very similar to the work of others.
	Poor	This has been done before. The paper should be rejected.
Significance of	Excellent	This is a major advance in this field
	Good	Advances the field.
	Satisfactory	A modest advance that may lead to additional work.
	Marginal	No one will care about the work in this paper.
	Poor	The results are trivial and the paper should be rejected.
Technical Accuracy	Excellent	The paper is accurate. It cannot be faulted on its methods, analysis, or conclusions.
	Good	The paper is accurate, but its methods, analysis, or conclusions could be improved.
	Satisfactory	There is a minor inaccuracy in this paper that must be corrected.
	Marginal	There is a major inaccuracy in this paper that must be corrected.
	Poor	There are sufficient inaccuracies in this paper that it should be rejected.
Rigor	Excellent	Well derived or argued paper.
	Good	Provides sufficient rigor in the paper that the results appear to be reasonable and accurate.
	Satisfactory	Needs to provide a better argument in places.
	Marginal	Extremely sloppy methods or analysis.
	Poor	Lacks any rigor whatsoever. The results cannot be substantiated based on the arguments given here.
Detail level	Excellent	The details in this paper are numerous so that it is easy for me to understand the importance of the results and the techniques by which they were arrived at.
	Good	The details in this paper are sufficient permit me to understand the results and the techniques.
	Satisfactory	The paper lacks some details so that I cannot be certain that the results are correct.
	Marginal	There are a number of details missing and they must be included to be able to justify the results.

	Poor	The paper contains so few details that it is impossible to judge its worth. It should be rejected.
Substantiation of conclusions	Excellent	If I performed the same work, I believe I would reach the same conclusions.
	Good	If I performed the same work, I am fairly confident I would reach the same conclusions.
	Satisfactory	If I performed the same work, I might reach the same conclusions, but I have some doubts.
	Marginal	If I performed the same work, I doubt I would reach the same conclusions.
	Poor	The paper does not substantiate the conclusions stated in this paper. The paper should be rejected.