# Review questions for DATA ARTICLE | SHORT (V1. Feb 2022)

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 DATA ARTICLE | SHORT format

This format is intended to document a new or revised data set and should be accompanied by a (DOI) link to the data set in a recognised data repository. These manuscripts are prepared using a standard [submission template](https://geusbulletin.org/index.php/geusb/author-instructions/initial-sub#templates). 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). The manuscript should include a tabular abstract to summarise the main features of the data described in the paper. The rest of the manuscript is divided into the following sections:

* Data collection
* Statistical analysis and data processing (if relevant)
* Data description and main features

Authors should focus on documenting and describing the data set and methodology only. They are asked to avoid lengthy introductions, discussions, interpretations or conclusions.

In reviewing this article, please consider whether the data set has been sufficiently described and documented, such that it can be understood and used in further research applications. The authors should only describe data included in the accompanying data set and their descriptions should encompass the full data set and not overlook important features of the data. The tabular abstract should be an accurate reflection of the data described in the rest of the manuscript. Data collection and any analytical methods should be documented such that they could be replicated by a qualified person. Lastly, this format does not require extensive contextual or study site information, but these can be requested as supplementary files if you think they would be helpful.

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

## 1. Style and contents

**Is the manuscript accessible to a broad geoscience academic readership?**

Is subject-specific terminology kept to a minimum or adequately defined where used? Are the potential applications of the data adequately stated?

[text field]

**Is the manuscript generally understandable?**

E.g. clear and precise writing, with few spelling errors or grammatical mistakes.

[text field]

## 2. Title

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

For these articles, we ask authors to include ‘data’ or ‘data set’ in the title.

[text field]

## 3. Main text

**Is the tabular abstract a fair reflection of the data as described in the rest of the manuscript?**

[text field]

**Is the full data set sufficiently described and documented?**

Note: Are any important features overlooked? Does the paper refer to data that are not supplied in the accompanying data set?

[text field]

**Are the methods appropriate and clearly described?**

Are all methods (field, analytical and statistical) documented, such that they could be replicated by a qualified person? Are standard methodologies appropriately cited?

[text field]

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

[text field]

**Would the paper benefit from any supplementary files, e.g. to provide additional background information or study site information?**

[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 alternative or additional figure or table? Note: The authors are limited to 3000 words and 4 mid-sized display items (figures and tables). ’Mid-size’ corresponds to c. 1/2 page or 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 be listed as 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