

Does the title clearly reflect the content of the article? Yes

Does the abstract present the main findings of the study? Yes

Are the research questions/hypotheses/predictions clearly presented? Yes

Does the introduction build on relevant research in the field? Yes

Are the methods and analyses sufficiently detailed to allow replication by other researchers?
Yes

Are the methods and statistical analyses appropriate and well described? Yes

In the case of negative results, is there a statistical power analysis (or an adequate Bayesian analysis or equivalence testing)? dont know

Are the results described and interpreted correctly? Yes

Have the authors appropriately emphasized the strengths and limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument? Yes

Are the conclusions adequately supported by the results (without overstating the implications of the findings)? Yes

--

Is anything known about how the various objects were deposited in the pit?

What was meant by most promising for functional analysis when the selection of objects was made? Selection criteria? Why were not all the objects included in the analysis? What made not everyone most promising for functional analysis?

Why must axes have been used? What contradicts the fact that they were deposited unused?

How common is heating in a regional perspective?

Fig. 8. Where on the axe are the traces of being used as a strike-a-light? Where exactly are the markings a and b placed? Compare with the clear markings in Fig. 7.

Vanmontfort et al., 2001/2002. Vanmontfort et al. 2001; Vanmontfort et al. 2002

Is Hayden 1989 eller 1979?