

Review of “Title of the paper” by “first or corresponding author of the paper”.

Reviewed by: *Your name*, but that is optional. If you prefer to remain anonymous simply skip this part.

In the first paragraph of your review you should briefly summarize the essential points presented in the paper. For instance, simply report that the authors are setting out to demonstrate that the world is flat and not spherical as is generally assumed. Resist your urge to critique this finding in this paragraph. Instead, try to highlight the positive, like this paper is well written with clear illustrations, etc.

In the second paragraph you state your opinion about the paper. First and foremost you should focus on whether or not the paper is *technically sound*. Substantiate your opinion here! It does not suffice to say that you “don’t believe it.” Secondly, you should provide your assessment of the *presentation of the work*; is the paper well organized (clearly defined hypothesis or research goal, adequate background information in the introduction, methods and results clearly explained, a discussion about strengths and weaknesses of the work, a useful conclusion or summary section), is the use of English adequate, are the figures and tables of good quality, etc. State your findings here in rather generic terms, you can offer more specific details below this paragraph. End this paragraph with a clearly stated recommendation to the Editors. For instance, *I recommend that the paper be accepted only after major revisions*.

IMPORTANT: If the paper is not technically sound and the flaws are rather fundamental, thus additional research or at least a complete rewrite of the paper is required, you should recommend *rejecting* the paper not revising it! Too often a reviewer is reluctant to reject a paper, knowing (from experience) how painful this is for the authors. However, a seriously flawed paper should be rejected with the understanding that the authors may always resubmit a new manuscript in which these flaws have been corrected. A recommendation of “publication after major revisions” may give the authors the unwarranted impression that after a little editing here and there the paper will certainly be published.

If you recommend (major) revisions, then a line-by-line evaluation is very helpful to the authors. Use your line-by-line evaluation to draw attention to specific technical or organizational shortcomings, illustrating what you already observed in the second paragraph of this review. You are certainly *not* required to provide a comprehensive English proofing. Instead, if relevant, illustrate the flaws in English with a few specific examples and then state that similar shortcomings are found throughout the paper. This line-by-line review is best offered as an itemized list, something like the following.

Line 123: Your statement that the earth is flat will need some references, preferably rather recent ones (from the 1900’s or later).

Line 322: It is not clear to me why the lenses in a spacecraft will distort the image of the earth to look like a sphere. Please be more specific. A reference would also be good.

Line 410: “spacial” must be “spatial.”

Line.....

Annotated manuscript

You may provide additional feedback by uploading an annotated manuscript (PDF file). Such an annotated manuscript may also take the place of the above-suggested line-by-line review. Keep in mind that in so doing you may be revealing your identity to the authors (inserts and comments may feature your name). If you seek to remain anonymous you can suppress identification in Adobe Acrobat under *Preferences* select *Commenting* and uncheck “Always use Log-in-Name for Author,” then click *OK*.