



# ACADIAN ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Publisher of

## THE JOURNAL OF THE ACADIAN ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY

### GUIDE TO REFEREES

The following questions may help in your assessment. The author(s) is/are most likely to consider your views objectively if they are constructive and stated diplomatically.

#### GENERAL

Is there knowledge worth publishing in a primary journal? Does the submission make a conceptual advance, apply new methodology, or refine or reformulate a concept or hypothesis?

Are the findings, interpretations, and conclusions sound, and relevant to the purpose of the study described?

Are descriptions of new taxa (e.g., genera, species), and the first time description of a member of the opposite sex of a known species, placed properly in context within an existing classification? Is a key provided? Is there some scientific significance other than validation of a new name?

Is the contribution placed in the proper perspective concerning the state of knowledge of the subject?

Is the manuscript too long? Would any of the text be clearer if condensed? Should the manuscript be condensed to a Note?

Are all tables and figures needed? Should they be grouped to facilitate comparisons? Are there inconsistencies between tables or figures and text, or within the text?

Should some of the data be made available separately, in a manuscript report or a data repository?

If the manuscript is from a dissertation, is emphasis maintained on the advance of science?

Does organization of the manuscript follow logically from the statement of purpose in the introduction?

Are summary statements given at the beginnings of sections or paragraphs?

Are results presented in terms of the biology rather than statistics (unless the contribution is in statistics)?

Is the presentation clear, concise, and unambiguous?

## **PARTS OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

Is the title limited to what is documented?

Is the abstract limited to the essentials of the new knowledge?

Is the Introduction limited largely to the purpose scope and rationale of the study?

Is the review of the literature limited to defining the problem?

Are details of materials and methods limited to what scientists need in understanding the design of the study and in judging validity of the finding?

Are results limited to answering the questions implied in the purpose of the work?

Are findings and inferences clearly distinguished?

Is discussion limited to interpretation and significance of the findings?

If there are loopholes in interpretation, are they acknowledged? Should they be overcome?

Is speculation limited to what is reasonably well supported by the findings?

Would combining the results and discussion under topic headings (research) simplify understanding of the work and convey the new insights more effectively?

## **RETURN OF REVIEWED MANUSCRIPT**

Referees should return the following three (3) attachments with their emailed review to the Associate Editor:

### *Attachment 1*

**The manuscript with indicated or suggested changes**

### *Attachment 2*

**Comments for transmission to author(s):**

### *Attachment 3*

#### **Referee's Evaluation:**

Minor revisions needed

Major revisions needed

Unsuitable, needs re-review

Unsuitable

**Confidential comments to the Associate Editor:**