

ECOLOGY, ECOLOGICAL MONOGRAPHS, AND ECOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS

Publications of the Ecological Society of America

MS No.

98-0682

First author

Editor

Reich

RATING OF MANUSCRIPT

Low

High

1	2	3	4	Importance to our readers
1	2	3	4	Originality of the research
1	2	3	4	Support of conclusions by data
1	2	3	4	Appropriateness for this journal
1	2	3	4	Clarity of presentation
1	2	3	4	Ratio of information + idea content to length

RECOMMENDATION TO THE EDITOR

- ____ Accept with minor revision
____ Accept with moderate revision
____ Possibly accept after major revision
____ Reject (publishable, but not in this journal)
____ More appropriate for these journals:

____ Reject (not worthy of publication)

Reviewer's name

Reviewer's address

Date

PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR REVIEW IN FOUR PARTS:

1. This rating form
2. Comments for the author(s) (two copies, please, when you mail your review)
(Do not include your recommendation to accept or to reject the paper)
3. A cover letter to the editor, with a brief, candid summary of your opinions about the paper
4. The manuscript (or your agreement to dispose of it)

- ☐ I have written comments on some pages of the manuscript. I will return the pages by mail.
- ☐ I have not written comments on the manuscript, so I am not returning the manuscript. I recognize that it is the intellectual property of the author(s), and will dispose of it.

FAX OR E-MAIL YOUR REVIEW TO:

FAX: (607) 273-3294

E-MAIL: esa_journals@cornell.edu

MAIL YOUR REVIEW (as backup for the "electronic review," and to return comments written on the manuscript) TO:

Ecological Society of America
118 Prospect Street, Suite 212
Ithaca, NY 14850-5616

ECOLOGY, ECOLOGICAL MONOGRAPHS, AND ECOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS

Publications of the Ecological Society of America

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

CONFIDENTIALITY—The enclosed manuscript is a privileged communication. Please do not show it to anyone or discuss it, except to solicit assistance with a technical point. Your review and your recommendation should also be considered confidential.

TIME—In fairness to the author(s), please return your review within 3 weeks. If it seems likely that you will be unable to meet this deadline, please return the manuscript immediately or call the Managing Editor today.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST—If your previous or present connection with the author(s) or an author's institution might be construed as creating a conflict of interest, but no actual conflict exists, please discuss this issue in the cover letter that accompanies your review. If you feel you might have any difficulty writing an objective review, please return the paper immediately, unreviewed.

COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR(S)—What is the major contribution of the paper? What are its major strengths and weaknesses, and its suitability for publication? Please include both general and specific comments bearing on these questions, and **emphasize your most significant points**.

General Comments:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Importance and interest to this journal's readers | 5. Organization and clarity |
| 2. Scientific soundness | 6. Cohesiveness of argument |
| 3. Originality | 7. Length relative to the number of new ideas and information |
| 4. Degree to which conclusions are supported by the data | 8. Conciseness and writing style |

Specific Comments:

Support your general comments with specific evidence. You may write directly on the manuscript, but please summarize your handwritten remarks in "Comments for the Author(s)." Comment on any of the following matters that significantly affected your judgment of the paper:

1. **Presentation**—Does the paper tell a cohesive story? Is a tightly reasoned argument evident throughout the paper? Where does the paper wander from this argument? Do the title, abstract, key words, introduction, and conclusions accurately and consistently reflect the major point(s) of the paper? Is the writing concise, easy to follow, interesting?
2. **Length**—What portions of the paper should be expanded? condensed? combined? deleted? (Please don't advise an overall shortening by X%. Be specific!)
3. **Methods**—Are they appropriate? current? described clearly enough so that the work could be repeated by someone else?
4. **Data presentation**—When results are stated in the text of the paper, can you easily verify them by examining tables and figures? Are any of the results counterintuitive? Are all tables and figures clearly labeled? well planned? too complex? necessary?

OVER

5. Statistical design and analyses—Are they appropriate and correct? Can the reader readily discern which measurements or observations are independent of which other measurements or observations? Are replicates correctly identified? Are significance statements justified?
6. Errors—Point out any errors in technique, fact, calculation, interpretation, or style. (For style we follow the *CBE Style Manual*, Fifth Edition, and the ASTM Standard E380-92, “Standard Practice for Use of the International System of Units.”)
7. Citations—Are all (and only) pertinent references cited? Are they provided for all assertions of fact not supported by the data in this paper?
8. Overlap—Does this paper report data or conclusions already published or in press? If so, please provide details.

FAIRNESS AND OBJECTIVITY—If the research reported in this paper is flawed, criticize the science, not the scientist. Harsh words in a review will cause the reader to doubt your objectivity; as a result, your criticisms will be rejected, even if they are correct!

Comments directed to the author should convince the author that:

1. you have read the entire paper carefully;
2. your criticisms are objective and correct, are not merely differences of opinion, and are intended to help the author improve his or her paper; and
3. you are qualified to provide an expert opinion about the research reported in this paper.

If you fail to win the author's respect and appreciation, your efforts will have been wasted.

ANONYMITY—You may sign your review if you wish. If you choose to remain anonymous, avoid comments to the authors that might serve as clues to your identity, and do not use paper that bears the watermark of your institution.

PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR REVIEW IN FOUR PARTS:

1. The rating form
2. Comments for the author (two copies, please, when you mail your review)
(Do not include your recommendation to accept or reject the paper)
3. A cover letter to the editor, providing a brief, candid summary of your opinion of the paper
4. The manuscript with comments written on it, or your agreement to dispose of it.

FAX OR E-MAIL YOUR REVIEW TO:

FAX: (607) 273-3294

E-MAIL: esa_journals@cornell.edu

MAIL YOUR REVIEW (as backup for the “electronic review,” and to return comments written on the manuscript) **TO:**

Ecological Society of America
118 Prospect Street, Suite 212
Ithaca, NY 14850-5616

OVER