

Guide for referees

A referee is asked to consider what contribution a paper makes to knowledge. Even though the referee may disagree with the author's opinions, the referee should allow them to stand, provided they are consistent with available evidence. Please note that it is the suitability of the paper for the *Journal of Hydrology (New Zealand)* that is to be assessed.

The table overleaf is designed to assist reviewers. While referees are cautioned from being overly negative in their comments suggestions to aid clarity, succinctness, and the quality of publications are welcomed. Authors welcome positive comments and constructive criticism. Please feel free to comment directly on the manuscript.

Criteria for Consideration

Information content

Is the topic suitable for the journal, significant and/or novel, and of interest to the journal's readership?

Objectives and methods

Are the objectives clear?

Is the methodology suitable and well executed?

Data analysis and statistical treatment

Are the data sufficient for the analysis?

Are the calculations and statistical treatment correct and adequate?

Are the interpretations/conclusions supported by the analysis?

Presentation and style

Is the information presented in a logical sequence?

Is the paper's length adequate, too brief for clarity, or could it be shortened?

Do the abbreviations, formulae, units and nomenclature conform with applicable international standards and rules?

Title

Is the title informative and a reflection of the content in as few words as possible?

Abstract

Is the abstract a clear and concise summary of the paper's content?

Illustrations and tables

Are all the illustrations and tables necessary?

Could the information in the text be more clearly and concisely presented by the use of more illustrations and/or tables, or vice versa?

References

Are all the references relevant, up to date, accessible and necessary?

Are any significant references omitted?

Manuscript:

Recommendation

- What is your overall recommendation?
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Publish with minor revision | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Publish with moderate revision | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Publish with major revision | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Reject | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Minor: phrasing, clarity of figures, references, small additions or removals. Moderate: restructuring, revision of argument or interpretation, but can be achieved without new data. Major: requires new data or major reinterpretation but has data or ideas of value and can realistically be saved. Reject: cannot be saved.

Overall Assessment

	No	Partly	Largely	Yes
Is the topic: suitable for the journal?				
of broad interest to the journal's readership?				
significant and/or novel?				
Is this contribution: significant and /or novel?				
ready for publication?				

Are the objectives clearly stated?				
Is the methodology suitable and well executed?				
Are the data of a quality appropriate for the analysis?				
Are the assumptions valid or adequately justified?				
Is the analysis appropriate and well executed?				
Are the interpretations/conclusions supported by the analysis?				
Is the contribution free of errors of fact or logic?				

Is the paper: logically organised?				
concise?				
well written, in correct English?				
Do the abbreviations, formulae, units and nomenclature conform with applicable international standards and rules?				

Is the title informative and a reflection of the content?				
Does the abstract accurately summarise the content?				

Are the illustrations and tables: useful and necessary?				
legible and understandable?				
Could information in the text be more clearly or concisely conveyed by the use of tables or figures, or vice versa?				

Is the referencing relevant, up to date, and accessible?				
Is all relevant work on this topic adequately referenced?				

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

To help the author to improve the paper, please comment objectively. Please document statements. If a paper repeats previously published work, please point this out.