# Review questions (V2.2 Feb 2022)

For submissions to RESEARCH ARTICLE, REVIEW ARTICLE, RESEARCH ARTICLE | SHORT and REVIEW ARTICLE | SHORT sections.

Thank you for agreeing to review this manuscript for the GEUS Bulletin. Please complete this questionnaire when returning your review. Your responses help our editors to decide whether to request major or minor revisions or decline or accept a submission. Unless indicated otherwise, your responses will be provided to the authors.

At the end of the questionnaire, you can upload documents as part of your review (e.g. a written summary or an edited manuscript) and make a recommendation (assessment decision) for the editor.

We recommend reading the [reviewer instructions](https://geusbulletin.org/index.php/geusb/reviewer-instructions) and [publishing criteria](https://geusbulletin.org/index.php/geusb/author-instructions/formats-pub-criteria) to learn about the journal’s remit and assessment criteria and our [guide for conducting a thorough review](https://geusbulletin.org/index.php/geusb/first-time-reviewers).

## About the RESEARCH ARTICLE and REVIEW ARTICLE formats

These articles document original research or a literature review in depth.

Submissions are not limited to a specific number of words or display items. However, they typically do not exceed *c*. 30 pages of typeset manuscript and should be well structured and written concisely. Authors can submit supplementary files to document additional explanatory text, figures, tables, media files or other files that provide useful, though not essential information. Any information or data essential to understanding the line of argument and conclusions developed in the manuscript should be presented in the main text.

These manuscripts may be rather specialist in nature and should be of interest to scientists in the field. Reviewers should consider the overall quality and readability, alongside the scientific merits of the article as described in our reviewer instructions.

Requested return time for comments: four weeks.

## About the RESEARCH ARTICLE | SHORT and REVIEW ARTICLE | SHORT formats

Short-format articles provide brief accounts of new research, case studies, or a literature review, early publication of which may be of interest to scientists in this or a related field.

Articles are limited to 3000 words for the main text, references, captions, acknowledgements and any additional information listed at the end of the manuscript, and typically 4 mid-sized display items (figures/tables).

In reviewing these articles, please consider the criteria listed in our [reviewer instructions](https://geusbulletin.org/index.php/geusb/reviewer-instructions) as well as the overall quality and readability of the manuscript in view of the limited space available. Bear in mind that detailed methods and other accompanying information can be submitted as supplementary files.

Requested return time for comments: two weeks.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## 1. Style and contents

**Is the manuscript (particularly the abstract and introduction) suitable for a broad geoscience academic readership?**

Is subject-specific terminology kept to a minimum or adequately defined where used?

[text field]

**Is the manuscript generally understandable and does it follow a logical structure?**

E.g. clear and precise writing, with few spelling errors or grammatical mistakes. Can the paper be shortened without compromising its contents?

[text field]

## 2. Title

**Is the title informative and concise? If not, can you suggest a better title?**

Note: 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.

[text field]

## 3. Main text

**Is sufficient introductory and background information provided?**

[text field]

**Does the manuscript contain a clearly defined research question, aims and objectives?**

[text field]

**Are methods appropriate, and both clearly and fully 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.

[text field]

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

[text field]

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

[text field]

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

[text field]

## 4. Display items (figures and tables)

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

Would some part of the text 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.

[text field]

## 5. Comments to the author(s)

### These comments will be provided to the author(s).

[text field]

## 6. Comments to the editor

These comments are for the editor only and will not be made known to the author(s).

[text field]

## 7. Review anonymity

**By default, we provide the names and affiliations of the handling editor and reviewers in the published paper to ensure openness and transparency. Please check the box below, if instead, you wish to remain an anonymous reviewer.**

Note: It is the reviewer’s responsibility to anonymise any files uploaded as part of the review. Please ask the editor handling the submission if you have any questions.

[–] I wish to remain anonymous

## 8. File upload and recommendation

**Are you willing to review a revised version of this manuscript?\***

[-] Yes

[-] No

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Below, you can upload documents as part of your review (e.g. an edited manuscript file) and choose a recommendation to the editor from the drop-down box.**

**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.

File upload

Recommendation