

## REFeree's REPORT: *TITLE OF PAPER*

*This document is provided as an example to suggest best practices in refereeing papers for Mathematics Magazine. We hope that you find the discussion and format provided here helpful as you think about how you are going to construct your own referee's report. We thank you for your service!*

### 1. SUMMARY

Here you should provide a brief summary of what the article is about, and its relationship to the literature.

### 2. GENERAL REMARKS

Here is where you include a short paragraph or two with your general take on the paper. Do you think it is interesting? What's good about the paper? Is it worthy of publication in Mathematics Magazine? Is it more appropriate for another journal? Too long? Well written? Is the work sufficiently original to merit publication? Are you recommending it for acceptance or not?

As a general rule, you should remember that you are writing to people who have presumably put some real time, thought, and energy into writing this paper. Criticism should be *constructive*. There is no need to be mean, nor needlessly cruel. Authors may be early career and in need of guidance that you can provide. On the other hand, you should be clear and explicit about what deficits you see in the paper so that the authors have the information they need to improve it and the editor has the information they need to make a decision about it. If you notice issues, you owe it to the authors and the editors to mention them, especially if they involve questions of academic honesty.

### 3. MAIN SUGGESTIONS

In this section you should describe any big picture items you would like to see fixed. Essentially, if you could only tell the authors two or three things that would significantly improve the paper, what would they be? How should they go about doing them? This is a great place to talk about organizational aspects of the paper, or connections to other places in the literature that the authors either failed to mention or are presumably unaware of. This is also an excellent opportunity to describe how the authors could make the paper more interesting.

The *next* section is where you collect all those comments about smaller suggestions, typos, confusing wording, missing citations, and other errata.

### 4. MINOR IMPROVEMENTS

Collected here are some suggestions for minor improvements to the paper listed by (**page, paragraph, line**), as well as some other comments that the authors may wish to address prior to publication. Deletions are indicated with strikeouts, while insertions are in bold.

- (1,2,3): This is a comment about something on the first page, in the second paragraph, on the third line of the paragraph.
- (1, 2, 4): Here is an example of how to indicate a change in wording you are suggesting: "...in ~~the~~ an altitude of the ~~square~~ **triangle**."
- (3, 2, 2): Here is an example of how to indicate an error in a mathematical formula: " ~~$\sqrt{2}$~~  $\leq 1 + \sqrt{2}e^{17}$ "
- (3, -2, -3): Sometimes it is easier to indicate, as I am here, that something should be counted from the *bottom* of the page. In this case, the comment would be about something on page 3, second paragraph from the bottom, third line from the end of the paragraph.
- (4,-2,1): Sometimes you want to mention a paper in your remarks. Especially when the paper is as much of a delight as [1] is!
- (5, 1, 3-6): Sometimes you want to talk about something that covers several lines of text.
- (6, Fig. 7): Other times you want to talk about something that appears in a figure.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B. Grünbaum. Geometry strikes again. *Mathematics Magazine*, 58(1):pp. 12–17, 1985. 2