

Meteorological Bulletin

Review Form

This review form represents a clear summary of review results and is not designed as a substitute for the verbal evaluation of the submitted manuscript, which the editorial office considers to be an essential part of the review. The answer "YES" is to be checked only in the event that you do not have any comments on a particular issue. Other answers are to be provided in detail and explained in the Comments section below the individual sections or in the Verbal Evaluation section of this review form. The final verbal evaluation should include your overall opinion of the reviewed article. Comments on the manuscript can also be written directly within the text using the Change Tracking feature. Please send us your review within four weeks following the receipt of this review form. If you cannot or do not want to perform any review, let us know immediately.

Article Title:

--

Authors' Names:

--

Evaluation of the Content, Professional and Formal Aspects

1. Topic. Does the article topic correspond to the Meteorological Bulletin's focus?							
<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remotely	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Comments:							

2. Originality. Does the article bring new insights, theories or methods the author (s) was (were) involved in; or is it a high-quality analysis of a significant or interesting situation, phenomenon, episode or period; or does it describe any significant new, generally accessible theories, observation methods, technologies, equipment, or their implementation in practice?							
<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Almost no	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Comments:							

3. Topicality. Does the article contain a topic of current interest or relevance?							
<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	Little	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Comments:							

4. Professional level. Is the subject of the article (methods and procedures used, analyses, theories, technologies, etc.) correctly and adequately described?							
<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	With minor reservations	<input type="checkbox"/>	With major reservations	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Comments:							

5. Conclusions. Do the submitted article conclusions relate to the content/subject of the article? Are the article conclusions substantive and non-speculative?							
<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly no	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Comments:							

6. Completeness. Does the manuscript structure comply with the structure of standard scientific publications? Does it include all elements of a scientific text?							
<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	With minor imperfections	<input type="checkbox"/>	With major imperfections	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Comments:							

7. Clarity and linguistic correctness. Is the article text understandable and linguistically correct?							
<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	With minor imperfections	<input type="checkbox"/>	With major imperfections	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Comments:							

8. Abstract. Is the English abstract apposite and stylistically and terminologically correct?						
	YES		Partially		Mostly no	NO
Comments:						

9. Keywords. Do the keywords adequately correspond and refer to the content of the article?						
	YES		Incompletely		Mostly no	NO
Comments:						

10. Citations. Are the literature citations relevant and appropriate?						
	YES		Mostly yes		Mostly no	NO
Comments:						

11. Figures. Are the scope and quality of the attached figures sufficient?						
	YES		Partially		Mostly no	NO
Comments:						

12. Tables. Are the scope and quality of the tables sufficient?						
	YES		Partially		Mostly no	NO
Comments:						

Reviewer's Verbal Evaluation, Notes, Comments and Suggestions

[Empty box for reviewer's verbal evaluation, notes, comments and suggestions]

Reviewer's Recommendations

	I recommend the article for publication without any modification.
	I recommend the article for publication after the implementation of the proposed modifications.
	I recommend the article to be returned for additions. Major changes and additions are needed.
	I do not recommend the article to be published in the Meteorological Bulletin.
	I recommend the article to be published in another journal.

The reviewer will again assess the submitted article after the changes have been incorporated by the author (s).

	YES
	NO

Reviewer

Review Report Date:	
Reviewer's First Name and Surname:	
Reviewer's Office:	

Date:

Reviewer's Signature:

--	--