GEUS Bulletin | Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland

GEUS Bulletin review questions

This document contains the questions that we ask reviewers to complete when returning their reviews. If you experience difficulties using the online submission system, you may request a copy of this document in an editable format to provide your responses.

Review questions (V2.1 September 2020)

Thank you for agreeing to review this manuscript for the GEUS Bulletin. When you submit your review online, you will be asked the following questions. These questions are intended to help you review the manuscript. Your responses help our editors to decide whether to request major or minor revisions or decline a submission.

At the end of the online form you can include additional comments you have for the authors. Your answers will be included in the decision letter to the authors and may be visible to the other reviewer(s).

There is also space to include comments for the editor only. These comments will not be seen by the authors.

At the end of the online form, you can upload any documents as part of your review (e.g. an edited manuscript file). Lastly, you will be asked to make a recommendation by selecting an option from a drop-down box. These options are explained at the end of this document.

If you haven't done so already, we recommend reading the reviewer instructions and publishing criteria to learn about the journal's remit and assessment criteria. You can also read our guide for conducting a thorough review on the GEUS Bulletin website.

1) STYLE AND CONTENTS

Is the style (particularly the abstract and introduction) suitable for a wide geoscience readership? (E.g. Is subject specific terminology kept to a minimum or adequately defined where used?)

So far as you can tell, is the manuscript generally understandable? (E.g. clear and precise writing, with few spelling errors or grammatical mistakes. Can the paper be shortened without compromising its contents?)

2) TITLE

Is the title informative and concise? If not, can you suggest a better title? (We encourage authors to use a declarative title that not only describes the topic but also informs on the main conclusion or take-home message of the study.)

3) MAIN TEXT

Is a necessary minimum of reference to previous work given? Have any key citations been omitted?

Are the methods appropriate and clearly described? (Note: In articles marked as 'short', authors are encouraged to provide detailed methods in a supplementary file if they do not have space in the main text. Standard methods should be accompanied by an appropriate citation.)

Are the conclusions clearly formulated and substantiated by the data presented?

Are any data/analyses missing that would otherwise support the conclusions and overall line of argument in the manuscript?

4) DISPLAY ITEMS (FIGURES AND TABLES)

Are the figures and tables of good quality? Do they require revisions? Please provide details.

You might consider whether the figures and tables are cited appropriately within the main text, and whether some part of the text would benefit from an additional figure or table.

Note: Articles marked as 'short' are limited to 3000 words and typically 4 mid-sized display items (figures and tables). A mid-sized figure is *c*. 1/2 page and equates to around 400 words.

5) COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR(S):

Please provide any additional comments/summary. These comments will be included in the decision letter to the author(s).

6) COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR:

Please provide any additional comments/summary. These comments are for the editor only and will not be made known to the author(s).

7) WILLINGNESS TO REVIEW AGAIN

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript? Yes or No.

8) REVIEW OPENNESS

By default, we now publish the names and affiliations of the handling editor and reviewers in the published paper. This helps to ensure openness and transparency for the scientific community. Please indicate if instead you wish to be listed as an anonymous reviewer.

Note: it is the reviewer's responsibility to ensure that their review remains anonymous, including any files uploaded as part of the review. Please ask the editor handling the submission, if you have any questions.

9) FILE UPLOAD AND RECOMMENDATION

Thank you for completing these review questions. You can upload any documents as part of your review (e.g. an edited manuscript file) and choose a recommendation to the editor from the drop-down box, online. If you are using this document to complete your review offline, please indicate your recommendation below and include any files when you return your comments to the editor handling the submission.

The recommendation options are as follows:

Accept submission: The manuscript can be published immediately, and no further revisions are required. This option is rarely applicable to manuscripts in the first round of reviews, and usually only applicable when reviewing a manuscript for the second time.

Revisions Required: The manuscript is publishable in principle but requires minor revision. E.g. to text or figures. The manuscript is unlikely to require another round of reviews.

Resubmit for review: The manuscript is publishable in principle but requires substantial revision. E.g. where the manuscript is flawed, perhaps severely flawed, but fixable. It may require rephrasing throughout, substantial reorganisation, additional figures/tables, a more detailed methodology or new analyses. The manuscript may or may not require another round of reviews.

Resubmit elsewhere: The manuscript is publishable in principle, but outside the scope of this journal.

Decline submission: The manuscript is fatally flawed and should not be published. E.g. the conclusions are not supported by the data presented or the submission suffers from methodological problems, which cannot be easily fixed with rewrites. Note: We usually ask authors to resubmit revisions in 30 days. If the manuscript is severely flawed but you anticipate that the authors will need more than 30 days to complete the revisions, you might also choose to decline the submission and explain this to the editor. Such a manuscript would require a second round of reviews if resubmitted.

See comments: Only choose this option if you feel unable to make a recommendation using the other options. This should rarely be applicable.