

Manuscript nr.

This interactive form aims at straightforwardly collecting diverse information on some of the methodological and formal aspects of the manuscript; where appropriate, and especially when a revision is recommended, it should be supplemented with comments or more specific suggestions, written either on a separate document or on the margins of the manuscript itself.

Items not relevant for a particular manuscript should be left unanswered.

This form, along with any documents containing additional comments, will be made anonymous before being sent to the manuscript authors.

1. Background

- The subject is of great interest to Conservation and Restoration
- The subject is of interest to Conservation and Restoration
- The subject has some interest for Conservation and Restoration, albeit indirectly
- The subject has no interest for Conservation and Restoration, neither directly nor indirectly

2. Type of text

- Article
- Intervention
- Note
- News
- Opinion
- Other

The characteristics of each type of text are described in

<http://revista.arp.org.pt/en/normas/tipos.html>. The next items should be evaluated taking into account the type of text assigned to the manuscript.

3. Relevance

- The subject, its perspective or its treatment are innovative
- The subject, its perspective or its treatment, although not new, are presented in an interesting way
- The subject, its perspective or its treatment are not methodologically innovative, but the text is interesting as a synthesis or as a case reporting
- The subject, its perspective or its treatment add little to what is already known and have no interest even as a synthesis or as a case report

4. Writing

- In general, the text is written correctly
- The text has some writing problems
- The text has significant writing problems

5. Organization

- In general, the text is well structured and organized
- The text has some issues at structural and/or content-organization level
- The text has significant issues at structural and/or content-organization level

6. Title

- The title is appropriate and in accordance with the content of the manuscript
- The title is inadequate or does not conform to the content of the manuscript

7. English title (in the case of a non-English manuscript)

- The English title is in accordance with the main language title and poses no problems
- The English title is in accordance with the main language title, but proofreading is necessary
- The titles in both languages are in agreement, but they both need to be revised or re-written
- The English title does not agree with the main language title and should be revised

8. Abstract

- The abstract describes the contents of the manuscript correctly
- The abstract has some content or organizational issues and should be reviewed
- The abstract does not fulfil its function in the least and must be rewritten

9. Abstract in English (in the case of a non-English manuscript)

- The English abstract is in accordance with the main language abstract and poses no problems
- The English abstract is in accordance with the main language abstract, but requires proofreading
- The abstracts in both languages are in agreement, but they both need to be revised or re-written
- The English abstract does not agree with the main language abstract and should be revised

10. Keywords

- The keywords are appropriate
- The keyword list should be revised

11. English keywords (in the case of a non-English manuscript)

- The English keywords are in accordance with the main language keywords and pose no problems
- The English keywords are in accordance with the main language keywords, but require proofreading
- The keyword lists in both languages are in agreement, but they both need to be revised or re-written
- The English keywords do not agree with the main language keywords and should be revised

12. Topic development

- In general, the topics are adequately developed and justified wherever necessary
- Some topics or justifications should be further developed
- In general, the topics or justifications are not sufficiently developed

13. Conclusions

- The conclusions are in accordance with the content of the manuscript
- The conclusions do not highlight the main contribution of the manuscript
- The conclusions are inadequate
- The conclusions are dispensable, taking into account the type of manuscript

14. Grounds for the figures

- The figures are justifiably used
- Some of the figures are not justified (the information they convey is irrelevant or could beneficially be inserted in the text)
- There is an excessive number of figures considering the size of the text
- There should be more figures

15. Formal aspects of the figures

- The graphs and diagrams are well built and adequate
- The graphs and diagrams need redesigning to show their intent more clearly

16. Grounds for the tables

- The tables are justifiably used
- Some of the tables are not justified (the information they convey is irrelevant or could beneficially be inserted in the text)
- There is an excessive number of tables considering the size of the text
- There should be more tables

17. Table organization

- The tables are well organized
- The tables have some organizational problems and should be revised
- The information in the tables should be organized differently

18. Number of bibliographic references

- The number of references is adequate
- The number of references is excessive
- There should be more references

21. Commentary

19. Type of bibliographic references

- The references are adequate and up-to-date
- Some references are not adequate
- Recent references are missing

20. Overall assessment

- The manuscript should be accepted as is
- The manuscript should be accepted after the revision of some aspects (form- or content-related)*
- The manuscript needs significant revision before it can be accepted*
- The manuscript should be rewritten and submitted as a new manuscript
- The manuscript should be rejected

**Please attach comments and/or suggestions under the next item or in a separate document, as requested above.*