



**Yukon Geological Survey
CRITICAL REVIEW FORM**

Title	Date Manuscript Received	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>		
Author(s)	<input type="text"/>	
Critical Reviewer (include email address)	<input type="text"/>	

*If this is a Yukon Exploration Geology (YEG) paper keep in mind that while this is an annual “grey literature” publication comprising reports of current research activities and not a refereed journal, papers are nevertheless expected to be well written, logical, and present interpretations that are well-supported by data. Graphics and tabular data should be legible, easy to understand, and **meet the criteria outlined in the YEG guidelines provided to authors.***

For ALL manuscripts reviewers are asked to provide comments that are specific, critical, and constructive; feedback will be provided to authors to improve the quality of their paper.

Critical reviewer

Please keep the following questions in mind when reviewing YGS papers:

Abstract:

Does the abstract adequately summarize key results presented in the paper and is it an appropriate length? Y N

Manuscript:

Is the manuscript well written? *i.e.*, Are the nature and scope of the project clearly described? Are observations and data well presented? Are interpretations adequately supported by the data? Are the implications of the study stated and discussed? Are similar studies appropriately cited and any discrepancies with previously-published studies discussed? Are the limitations of the study clearly stated (*e.g.*, are assumptions noted; do analytical data include metadata such as detection limits, *etc?*)

Graphics:

Are graphics (maps, photos, graphs, diagrams) clear and easy to understand? Are all graphics necessary? Should additional graphics be included? Are figure captions clear? Are figures properly cited in the text?

Tables:

Are tables legible? Do they contain data that are referenced in the manuscript? Do the tables add value to the paper or are some unnecessary? Are table captions clearly written? Do the tables conform to required size?

References:

Has the author cited appropriate references? Are there important references missing? Are references properly cited (note that YGS will review references formatting for YEG)?

Recommendation:

I recommend that this paper be Accepted Accepted with minor revisions Accepted with major revisions
Deferred for a year¹ (deferral option applies to YEG papers) Rejected²

1. As YEG has rigid deadlines, a reviewer may recommend that a paper be deferred to the following year to allow time to make significant revisions, or in order for further data to be collected and interpreted (e.g. in the case of a multi-year study).

2. A recommendation for rejection implies that even with major revisions the paper is not suitable for publication in YEG. If you recommend rejection, please provide an explanation.

Comments (add further pages with detailed notes if necessary):

Signature

Date (yyyy-mm-dd)

Author

I have read the reviewer's comments and

accept most accept some accept few/none (state why)

Signature

Date (yyyy-mm-dd)