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

Thank you for agreeing to review this manuscript for the GEUS Bulletin. Please complete this form 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 METHOD ARTICLE | SHORT format

This format is intended to document a new or revised method, experiment, instrumentation network, software or model. 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 method. The rest of the manuscript is divided into the following sections:

* Resources required
* Methodological protocols or Experimental setup
* Validation or Example data

Authors should focus on documenting and describing the method and provide validation/example output data. Authors should avoid lengthy introductions, discussions, interpretations or conclusions. Authors are encouraged to submit related data sets and other supplementary files with their manuscript that would help document and demonstrate the method/equipment used.

In reviewing this article, please consider whether the method is valid and sufficiently documented such that a qualified person can reproduce it. All steps of the method should be described. No important features should be overlooked, and the paper should not contain superfluous information. The example output data should support the validity of the method. The tabular abstract should be a fair reflection of the method as described in the manuscript. 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?

[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?**

[text field]

## 3. Main text

**Does this manuscript document a new method whose publication in this format would benefit the scientific community? Or if it documents a revised method, does this article represent a substantial step forward that warrants publication as a standalone, peer-reviewed article?**

[text field]

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

[text field]

**Is the method valid and sufficiently described? Can any part be improved or expanded upon?**

Are all methods (field, analytical and statistical) documented, such that they could be replicated by a qualified person? Are standard methodologies appropriately cited? Are any important resources or steps overlooked? Does the paper refer to steps that are superfluous to this method?

[text field]

**Have the authors supplied sufficient validation or examples of output data?**

[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 typically 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 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 options

**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