



THE PREHISTORIC SOCIETY

Dr MICHAEL J. ALLEN: Series Editor, c/o Redroof, Green Rd, Codford, Wilts, BA12 0NW ,
Tel: 07828 103454 or 01985 850713; Email: aea.escargots@gmail.com
[www/prehistoricsociety.org](http://www.prehistoricsociety.org)

NOTES FOR REVIEWERS OF PAPERS SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION IN THE PREHISTORIC SOCIETY RESEARCH PAPER

The Society's Research Papers is peer-reviewed series that publish collections of edited papers covering aspects of Prehistory. These may be derived from conferences, or research projects; they specifically **exclude** the publication of single excavation reports. The Research papers present the fruits of the best of prehistoric research, complementing the Society's respected *Proceedings* by allowing broader treatment of key research areas. We therefore have a special responsibility to ensure that what we publish is of the highest standard as measured both nationally and internationally. We rely on our system of independent referees to ensure the Series' continuing high standards and lasting value. Each paper we receive is read and commented on by at least one referee and by the Volume Editors/Series Editor or member of the Editorial Advisory Committee. All papers are considered entirely on merit and all refereeing is strictly anonymous unless the Editor is instructed otherwise by the referee concerned. The final decision is always the Editor's. The Editors, at the referees' suggestion, may even decline an invited or commissioned paper.

Our referee's comments guide the editor(s) to help us ensure that we have good, well-presented cogent papers. They help ensure quality, accuracy, appropriateness, and relevance as well as avoiding omissions or areas not considered by the author(s). Please give us your frank assessment of the paper, in *c.* 200–400 words. When reading the manuscript we would like you to think about the questions listed below under Sections 1–5. Do not feel you have to comment on every one of them, but it will be helpful if your overall recommendation (Section 5) can be clearly justified to the Editor in terms of what you say under Sections 1–4. * = most significant sections/questions

* *Section 1: Originality, Importance, Accuracy*

- 1.1 Is this relevant to the volume, and does it make a significant contribution in relation to other papers submitted to the volume?
- 1.2 What contribution will this paper make to prehistoric archaeology?
- 1.3 Does it duplicate previously published work?
- 1.4 How original are the data, discussion and ideas?
- 1.5 Are the contents and discussion accurate and of sufficient standard for an international journal of record?

Section 2. Organisation and Structure

- 2.1 Does the Introduction make the author's point of departure sufficiently clear?
- 2.2 Are the problems addressed and the aims of the paper adequately defined?
- 2.3 Are the data cited in the paper well integrated into the overall argument?
- 2.4 Do the conclusions follow logically from the arguments presented?

Section 3. Presentation

- 3.1 Is the writing style clear and concise?
- 3.2 Are sub-headings used appropriately and helpfully?
- 3.3 Are tables and figures helpful and clear, and the captions to them adequate?
- 3.4 Is the in-text referencing appropriate?
- 3.5 Is the Abstract appropriate?
- 3.6 Does the title of the paper reflect its content?

Section 4. Length

The Editors of each volume should have given authors a word length or guide. Text should not duplicate information that is obvious from tables and figures.

- * 4.1 Could the paper be usefully cut down, or usefully expanded?
- 4.2 Are the number and size/content of tables and figures appropriate?

* *Section 5. Recommendation*

Do you regard the paper as suitable for publication in the proposed volume; does it fit within the remit of that volume? Please make one of the following recommendations:

- 5.1 Yes, in its present form
- 5.2 Yes, with minor changes as specified
- 5.3 No, or only after major modifications
- 5.4 No, not at all