Manuscript Review Guideline

Spatial Information Research (SIR)

1. Paper Title:

It is not necessary to answer each of these questions, one by one. Think of the items below as a tool for reflection as you evaluate a manuscript for publication in SIR.

2. General Comments

1) Please rate the significance of this work in the field (e.g. remote sensing, GIS, cadastre, photogrammetry), compared to other papers on similar themes recently published in the spatial information Science field.

2) Is the subject matter of this paper appropriate for SIR? (See the SIR homepage for a description of the scope of SIR)

3) Does the title of the manuscript accurately reflect the content?

4) Abstract and Conclusion

It is helpful to comment on the Abstract. Does the abstract summarize the paper's objectives, main thrust and major conclusions? Please consider whether or not the Abstract conveys clearly the purpose of the study, provides a balanced and accurate depiction of the key findings, and addresses the implications of the work for spatial information Science. Could a person read the abstract and get a clear sense of what the article will be about? Will the key words enable other professionals to locate the work with the search engines commonly used by academic libraries? What about the conclusion? Does the manuscript give a sense of revisiting the main ideas briefly? Does it give the reader a feeling that all of the ideas have been tied together?

3. Originality of the Paper

Does the manuscript make a significant scientific contribution to the field of SIR and will the information provided advance our understanding? Does the content of the article have appeal for the diverse audience of SIR Journal? Does the work advance knowledge in the field? Does it make an original contribution or provide a fresh perspective on a persistent issue?
Has proper credit been given to previously published work related to the material presented? Is the literature review accurate, up-to-date, and balanced? Does the review cite leaders in the field and authoritative scholarly sources of support rather than textbooks or internet sources? Are there additional sources that you would recommend?

The assertions made about the meaning of the results should be consistent with the data and should take into account both the practical and statistical significance of the data. Plausible explanations should be offered for data that differ from what was expected or from other literature and alternative explanations for the findings should be offered. The unique contributions of the findings to the literature should be conveyed to the reader. All key study limitations should be noted. It is also essential that attention be paid to the implications (theory, research, practice, policy) of the data.

Referees should report any breach of publishing ethics that they identify directly to the Editor. The following may constitute a breach: Plagiarism, Manipulated images/photos/figures, Biased reference list, Duplicate publication, Data from previous publication reused without proper referencing.

4. Clarity of Presentation

How would you rate the overall organization and presentation of the paper (consider vocabulary, grammar and syntax)? Is the length of the paper justified?

What about style? Is the language scholarly, yet accessible, so that readers ranging from college students to professors will understand it? Are unfamiliar terms defined and is excessive jargon avoided? Are all symbols, terms and concepts adequately defined? Does the style suit the article type (e.g., practical, theoretical, research)?

What about overall organization? Does every paragraph really belong where it is placed? Does one section of the manuscript flow into the next seamlessly? Is each paragraph cohesive? Are there specific headings and subheadings to guide the reader through the manuscript?

What is the level of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation in the manuscript? Do you have the sense that the author has delved into the relevant literature and reflected upon the various facets of the topic? Does the manuscript present a clear, logical argument? The paper's summary and conclusions are:

Is the article carefully prepared and error free? Does it adhere to the style requirements of the SIR? Are all of the references in the proper format? Are any important references missing and are the included references useful? Is it free of spelling and typing errors or does it show signs of haste in preparation? Is the manuscript succinct? Does it get to the point and stay on the subject? Are
there some obvious places where it could be improved by skillful pruning?

5. Illustrations (tables, charts and figures)

Does the author make effective use of illustrative material? Have the tables, figures, and other visual material been used judiciously and are they worthy of the journal space to publish them? The findings should be presented in a fashion that is consistent with the study's goals and hypotheses. The data analytic approach used should be designed to answer the study's questions and should be matched to the nature of the data. Regardless of the type of study, quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods, the results should be presented in a fashion that is reader-friendly, concise, fluid, and interesting. Tables and figures should help bring the findings to life.

Are all illustrations labeled with figure/table numbers, captions and/or titles?

Are all illustrations necessary?

Are any additional illustrations needed?

Overall, I would rate the graphical quality of the illustrations as:

Specify any unnecessary illustrations

Identify any specific problems with graphics or illustrations

6. Recommendation

Accept the paper without modification.

Accept the paper subject to minor revision.

Reject the paper subject to major revision, but inform the author that the paper will be reconsidered if it incorporates mandatory revisions. The paper requires significant changes before it can be published.

Reject the paper. The paper will not be reconsidered. If your recommendation is to reject this paper, please state the reasons. Can the flaws in this manuscript be remedied in a revision or is there a fatal flaw?