

Evaluation form for peer reviewers of CONSERVATION UPDATE

Is the title well chosen?	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, what would be your suggestions for improvement?		
Is the abstract well written and properly structured (objective(s), methods, results, conclusions) and does it summarize the most important aspects of the paper?	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, what would be your suggestions for improvement?		
Are the keywords appropriate?	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, what would be your suggestions for improvement, what key words should be added/deleted?		
Is the overall structure of the paper clear and appropriate (introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion)?	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, what would be your suggestions for improvement?		
Does the introduction clearly identify the underlying problem in the context of the present knowledge in this domain? Does it clearly state the aim(s) of the paper?		
If not, what are the weak points?		
Does the author acknowledge related research published by others?		
If not, which articles, books, etc. have been omitted?		
Does the author clearly explain the methodology followed for tackling the problem, and the reasons for using the specific methodology?	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, please indicate the weak points.		
Is the quality of the figures (photos, tables, etc.) good enough?	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, please make suggestions for		

improvement.		
Are numerical data presented in figures or tables, and are these well-organized and structured?	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, what would be your suggestion for improvement?		
Is the conclusion well motivated and sufficiently discussed?	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, what could be done to improve this aspect?		
Is the language used clear and correct and are the technical terms correct? (The peer is not asked to improve the English in general)	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, what are the particular weak points?		
Are the references relevant, complete and up-to-date	yes <input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
If not, what are the problems in this respect?		

Name of the peer

Date of the peer review

Inspired by http://guidelines.kaowarsom.be/evaluating_scientific_papers (23_2_2021)