

CHECKLIST FOR THE REVIEWER

Hydrometallurgy

A few guidelines

- * To provide the author(s) with the means to improve their paper, please comment objectively. On a separate sheet you may provide comment for the editor that you may feel necessary.
- * Please document statements adequately.
- * If a paper repeats previously published work please point this out to the editor.
- * Please explain the reasons for your answers on separate sheets, keying your comments to the letters A-M. You may of course also provide any further comment, keying your remarks to numbers in the margin of the manuscript
- * Some of the questions that follow should be answered on a scale of 1 to 3, **where 1 is the highest rank and 3 is the lowest.** (Please encircle your answers.)

Manuscript:

Do you agree to your identity being revealed to the author(s)? Yes No

A Is this topic

1 suitable for the journal?	Yes	No
2 of broad international interest?	Yes	No
3 significant?	Yes	No
4 novel?	Yes	No

Please explain your answers to items A1-4 here (briefly):

B Clarity of objectives: 1 2 3

C Quality of methods/correctness of mathematics: 1 2 3

D Quality of data: 1 2 3

E Validity of assumptions and analyses: 1 2 3

F Extent to which the interpretations/conclusions are supported by the data: 1 2 3

G Overall significance of this work: 1 2 3

H Is this paper

1 properly organized?	Yes	No
2 to the point/concise?	Yes	No
3 written clearly using correct grammar and syntax?	Yes	No

I Are the approach, results and conclusions intelligible from the abstract alone? Yes No

J Is the title informative and a reflection of the content? Yes No

K Are the illustrations/tables

1 useful and all necessary?	Yes	No
2 of good quality?	Yes	No

L Is the referencing relevant, up to date and accessible? Yes No

M Are the keywords (if provided) appropriate and complete? Yes No

N Overall quality of the work: 1 2 3

COMMENT FOR THE EDITOR

Manuscript:

O Can you suggest any improvements to this work, or any parts which could be shortened or removed?

P Is this work acceptable in its present form? Yes No

Q Would this work be acceptable after 1 minor revision?
2 moderate revision?
3 major revision?

R Is this work unacceptable? Yes No

Please ensure that your final evaluation accords with your answers to the questions, especially should you be considering major revision or rejection.

S Should you recommend major revision, do you believe this paper can be "saved" by revision? Yes No

Thank you. Your cooperation is much appreciated.

Date: Name (printed and signed):
