### Reviewer’s Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Rating</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Originality:</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Quality:</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Presentation:</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Significance:</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Disposition**

- [ ] Accept the manuscript in its present form
- [ ] Accept after minor revisions; do not send me the revision for a second review
- [ ] Requires major revision; send me the revised version for a second evaluation
- [ ] Reject
- [ ] Should it go elsewhere? Where?
Questions for reviewers to consider

1. Is the study an original contribution in its field?

2. Does the author make errors in inference, interpretation, or mathematical analysis?

3. Does the material lend itself to application in its field?

4. Is the author’s presentation clear, concise and well-organized?

5. Is the abstract informative, giving the essence of the research in clear terms?

6. Does the paper follow the AMS policy on the use of SI units as stated in the Author’s Guide?
1. ACCEPT: Publish the manuscript in its present form.

2. ACCEPT AFTER MINOR REVISION: Do not send me the revision for a second review. As long as the author’s revisions have accommodated the reviewer’s criticisms, the manuscript may then be accepted by the Editor. The revisions may necessitate rewording for clarity, reducing length, or other factors.

3. ACCEPT WITH MAJOR REVISION: Send me the revised version for a second evaluation. This category is nearly the same as #2, but you feel strongly that the revision must incorporate critical points necessitating additional review.

4. REJECT: Grounds for rejection include such flaws as lack of originality, poor technical quality, treatment of a problem distinctly unimportant or trivial, scientific incompetence, or exposition and approach at a level below standards of the AMS.

5. SHOULD IT GO ELSEWHERE? WHERE? While the original decision was made to consider the paper for JAMC, your review may result in a recommendation that the content is inappropriate and it should be submitted elsewhere.
Some reasons for rejection

1. Previous papers have presented in details calibration and performance of the XXX, so there are very little new results in the manuscript. The three original research areas identified by Reviewer B and C are not substantial enough for a peer-reviewed journal article. The manuscript is also too long because of the repeat of results from other published papers and too much technical details. The latter makes the paper more like a technical report or an operator’s manual.

2. They all agree that the MS does not contain significant new or original information for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Maybe only significant contribution is the video camera, which, however, is not described in details.

3. Based in large part on my discovery of the major duplication between this manuscript and two previously accepted manuscripts and the limited value of the remaining portion of the manuscript, I am sorry to say that I have to reject the manuscript. You must avoid duplication in your series of manuscripts on the similar subject, and the significant dependence on other submitted manuscripts which are not available to the reviewers is to be discouraged.

4. The MS is lack of scientific originality, and the results are not conclusive based on very limited data sampling (one single rainfall event).

5. Both technical and scientific quality of the MS, and the clarity of presentation need significantly improvement. Reviewers A and C found faults in Equations (1) and (2).
1. It is very useful to have a native English speaker to proofread your manuscript before you submit it.

2. Abstract:
   • Focus on summarizing new and important results.
   • Do not spend the large portion to describe what you did.
   • Do not repeat the sentences in the abstract and the “Conclusions” section.
   • Can the abstract be understood without reading the paper first?

3. Journal papers vs. technical reports or conference papers
   • Limit the technical details
   • Reorganize the report to write a story for a journal paper
   • Remove redundant information

4. Don’t directly copy the text from published papers (yours or others)

5. Avoid inaccurate and unjustified statements

6. Please consider the reviewers’ recommendations seriously and send item-by-item responses to each comment. If you have not addressed a reviewer’s comment in the revised text, you should clearly state your position on the matter and why you have chosen to ignore the comment. Please remember to respond to the Editor’s comments too.