# Review questions for MAP DESCRIPTION (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 MAP DESCRIPTION format

This format comprises a descriptive text to a published geological map produced by GEUS and covering Denmark or Greenland. Manuscripts typically follow a standard structure, as detailed in the optional submission template.

The text must correspond to a published map sheet, which should be made available to the reviewer alongside the manuscript. Reviews should consider whether the text is an accurate representation of the published map and adheres to the standard format expected of this type of submission, as described in the submission template. The review should identify any important information that is incomplete or missing, as well as judge the scientific merit and overall quality of the written manuscript.

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

## 1. Style and contents

**Is the style suitable for a wide geoscience 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. Main text

**Does the manuscript provide an accurate representation of the published map?**

[text field]

**Does the manuscript adhere to the standard format for this type of submission, as described in the submission template? Or is the structure logical and are all important mapped features documented adequately?**

[text field]

**Is any important information incomplete or missing?**

[text field]

**Are the methods (field, analytical or statistical) appropriate and clearly described?**

[text field]

**How do you judge the scientific merit and overall quality of the written manuscript? Are the conclusions clearly formulated and substantiated by the data presented?**

[text field]

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

[text field]

## 3. 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?

[text field]

## 4. Comments to the author(s)

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

[text field]

## 5. Comments to the editor

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

[text field]

## 6. 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

## 7. 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