Please respond promptly to a review request. Normal review time is one month. If you know you will be unable to review a manuscript due to time constraints or because the subject area is outside your expertise, please reply promptly to the appropriate editor so another reviewer can be contacted. Once you accept a review, if you are unavoidably delayed in completing your review, please inform the editor immediately. Complete the enclosed manuscript review form in detail, sign and date it, and return it with the marked manuscript and any additional comments.

Write comments and proofreader marks obviously and legibly on the manuscript.

Rate the paper using the following definitions:

- **Excellent**—well-organized, well-written, well-illustrated paper with outstanding scientific/technical merit
- **Very good**—well-organized paper with strong scientific/technical merit that needs some rewriting or better illustrations
- **Good**—well-written paper with scientific/technical merit that needs some reorganization or better illustrations
- **Fair**—paper with some scientific/technical merit that needs significant reorganization, rewriting and/or better illustrations
- **Poor**—poorly organized, poorly written paper with little or no scientific/technical merit.

In general, a paper must attain an overall rating of good or better from the reviewers to be accepted provisionally for publication. Final acceptance requires that the author(s) must satisfactorily address any criticisms or recommendations for revisions made by the reviewers.

Please note the following instructions:

**Quality of data is of paramount importance.** Make sure that the conclusions are justified based on the data presented and existing knowledge.

**Require scientific integrity in the manuscript.** Check that all ideas and information that are not common knowledge are appropriately referenced.

When the idea is to build upon previous studies, the manuscript in review must put its findings in the context of previous research. If the research is completely new, all theories and positions must be thoroughly explained or addressed.

Point out good information and insights as well as weak points.
Make specific suggestions to improve the paper’s readability and clarity. Point out jargon and terms that may be unknown to the general reader. Authors who need help with writing appreciate specific helpful suggestions. However, do not feel compelled to rewrite a poorly written paper.

Read the manuscript more than once. Your perspective may change with additional reading of the manuscript. Think about your reactions and comments before submitting the review.

Keep in mind that some authors may have had financial or other constraints on their research. Suggest another approach if you know one, but do not insist that it is the only possible one.

Support and justify all of your comments and recommendations by elaborating on your ideas or providing examples. It is more helpful to the author(s) when you suggest changes if you also explain why and how to incorporate them.

Take a wide perspective in your review in addition to paying attention to specifics. Papers published in E&EG should have broad appeal.

Remember that authors are our peers. Respectful, constructive criticism will be well-received, whereas personal attacks are unprofessional and unproductive. The common goal of authors, reviewers, and editors is to present important research in the best manner possible.

Additional information, suggestions, and advice for peer reviewers on writing fair and objective reviews of manuscripts may be found in:
