

## Notes for Reviewers of Papers Submitted for Publication in *The Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*

As the journal of the Prehistoric Society, we 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 journal's continuing high standards and lasting value. Thank you for helping us fulfil this important responsibility.

All papers are considered entirely on merit regardless of any financial backing, and all refereeing is strictly anonymous unless the Editor is instructed otherwise by the referee concerned. The final decision always belongs to the Editor-in-Chief. Editorial decisions consider the wide range of interests of the Journal's readership. Papers should bring the latest research and discoveries of the period before the Society's membership and our wider audience.

All peer reviews should be carried out with the aim of providing constructive criticism, in a courteous and clear manner. Our policy is to pass peer-review reports on unedited. However, where reviews contain potentially libellous, offensive, hostile or unethical content, or appear unhelpfully phrased, we may ask you to revise your text. You may be removed from the reviewer pool if you refuse, on request from an Editor, to remove any inappropriate comments.

Please give us your frank assessment of the paper in a minimum of 200 words. When reading the manuscript, we would like you to think about the questions listed below. Do not feel you have to comment on every one of them, but it will be helpful if your overall recommendation can be clearly understood in terms of what you say in the sections before.

### Originality, Importance, Accuracy

- What contribution will this paper make to prehistoric archaeology?
- Does it duplicate previously published work?
- How original are the data, discussion, and ideas?
- Are the contents and discussion accurate and of sufficient standard?

### Organisation and Structure

- Is the paper structured in a logical way, with enough (sub)headings?
- Are the problems addressed, and the aims of the paper adequately defined?
- Are the data cited in the paper well integrated into the overall argument?
- Do the conclusions follow logically from the arguments presented?

### Presentation

- Is the writing style clear and concise? [note: you are not required to do any (copy)editing]
- Is the paper of a good length, or could portions be cut down/placed into online supplementaries?
- Are tables and figures necessary, helpful and clear, and the captions to them adequate?
- Is all necessary literature included, and are statements well-supported with in-text references as necessary? [you do not have to check the completeness of the bibliography!]

### Recommendation

- Do you regard the paper as suitable for publication in the proceedings? Please make one of the following recommendations:
  - Yes, in its present form
  - Yes, with minor changes as specified
  - Possibly, but only after major modifications
    - In this case, would you be willing to review a revised version? Yes / No
  - No, not at all

If you have any questions about this guidance, please contact the PPS Editorial team at:  
[editors@prehistoricsociety.org](mailto:editors@prehistoricsociety.org).