Geophysical Research Letters

AN AGU JOURNAL

Reviewer Instructions

Navigating the System

When you first log into the system, you will be taken to your home page, also called your desktop. The manuscript you have agreed to review will be under Reviewer Tasks and will be marked with a red arrow . After clicking on this link, you will be presented with a manuscript screen containing:

- Reviewer instructions
- Manuscript details and files
- Review form (accessible by clicking on "Review manuscript" link)

Printing the Manuscript

When printing a copy of the manuscript pdf, modify print settings: Under Page Handing/Page Scaling, choose "Shrink to Printable Area." If you experience difficulties opening or printing files, contact the <u>Editor's Assistant</u>.

Preparing your comments

If you prefer to work offline, you may download and print the PDF file, draft your review remarks using a word processor, and cut/paste it back into the reviewer remarks text area.

Guidelines for Reviewers

Geophysical Research Letters aims to provide rapid publication of forefront research that has an immediate impact on the science community. The journal

features articles from a broad range of geophysical disciplines we ask your help as a reviewer in evaluating both scientific content (Categories 1-4) and presentation quality (Categories A-C) to determine if a submitted manuscript meets GRL standards.

We welcome and will pass on to authors any specific suggestions which would materially improve the quality of a manuscript. Your comments will be conveyed anonymously to the authors unless you clearly indicate in your review that you wish your identity to be made known.

For more information or tips for writing a solid peer review please see this <u>Eos</u> feature article.

Science and Presentation Categories

GRL uses science and presentation categories to evaluate manuscripts. Please read the following criteria to help you decide which science and presentation categories most accurately describe the manuscript you're reviewing:

Science Category 1. The manuscript meets one or more of the following criteria. If the manuscript falls in Category 1, please give sufficient detail as to which of the below points are applicable and why.

- Important new science at the forefront of an AGU discipline
- Innovative research with interdisciplinary/broad geophysical application
- Instrument or methods manuscript that introduces new techniques with important geophysical applications

Science Category 2. The manuscript is potentially Category 1 but significant clarification/revision is needed. If possible, please specify the significant revisions that might allow this manuscript to meet Category 1 criteria. For example, the manuscript presents

- Some unclear or incomplete scientific reasoning
- Inadequate presentation of data
- An instrument/method where the geophysical application is not obvious

Science Category 3. The paper is publishable in the refereed literature but is unlikely to become a Category 1 paper.

- A scientifically correct paper but not obviously a significant advance in a geophysical field
- A solid paper with little immediate impact on the research of others: e.g., a routine application of a standard research technique or a new measurement or laboratory method with limited geophysical application

 A good, clear, but basically incremental improvement to existing data sets, models, or instruments

Science Category 4. This paper is basically not publishable in an AGU journal.

- There are major scientific errors in the manuscript
- Essentially the same material has been published or is being considered for publication elsewhere
- The technique is not useful
- The research area is not representative of an AGU discipline

Presentation Categories

Presentation Category A. Category A manuscripts should meet ALL of the following:

- Abstract is succinct (<150 words), accurate, and comprehensible to a nonspecialist
- Manuscript is generally well-written, logically organized, and adequately illustrated
- Figures and tables are understandable and readable (when sized for GRL)
- English usage and grammar is adequate, with few spelling/typographical errors (please specify any minor fixes)

Presentation Category B. Potentially a Category A manuscript with revision. If you select Category B, you should give explicit direction as to which sections/features need revision, and extension or reduction, for example,

- Abstract needs to be rewritten/shortened
- Manuscript is not well written, is not logically organized, is inadequately illustrated
- Manuscript needs to be (and can be) shortened
- English usage, grammar, or spelling errors detract from the paper

Presentation Category C. The manuscript cannot readily be revised by the authors into Category A.

- Specific ideas cannot be adequately presented within the 12 publication unit GRL limit
- Organization and illustration of the manuscript make it too difficult to review fairly
- English usage, grammar, and/or spelling errors are endemic and require substantial copyediting before this manuscript can be published (or even reviewed adequately)

GRL highlights several manuscripts in each issue. If you feel that this manuscript is particularly exciting and deserves to be highlighted, please include in your review a short note as to its importance.

Please recognize that the final decision on a manuscript is made solely by the Editor using the expertise of several reviewers and based on the above criteria.

Annotated Manuscript

While we prefer that you upload all annotations electronically, if you are mailing (via postal mail) an annotated manuscript, please send to:

GRL, Journal Staff American Geophysical Union 2000 Florida Ave, NW Washington, DC 20009

Review Criteria

- Is this paper significant and appropriate for the journal?
- Are the interpretations and conclusions adequately supported by the evidence presented? That is, are the assumptions valid, is the methodology sound, is the evidence adequate, and do the conclusions logically follow?
- Does this paper put the progress it reports in the context of existing published work? Is there adequate referencing and introductory discussion?
- Is the paper clearly and concisely written?
- Are all parts of the text, references, graphics and tables necessary for the new results and main points to be understood?
- Are the conclusions and potential impacts of the paper clear?
- Does the abstract clearly and concisely summarize the paper and state the main results? Can the abstract and main body of the paper each stand alone?
- Are the graphics and tables clear and their captions self-explanatory?
- Does the title adequately represent the content of the paper?
- Reviewers must ensure that authors comply with <u>AGU's Data Policy</u>, which requires authors to include information on data availability regarding the paper.

See <u>Reviewer expectations</u> as it relates to the Data policy.

See <u>Text Requirements</u> for more thorough information on how to apply the standards in your paper.

Tips for Reviewers

- If you are unable to meet the deadline, contact the journal staff immediately, so that the Editor or Associate Editor can determine the appropriate course of action. Extensions are granted at the discretion of the Editor or Associate Editor.
- If you will be unable to review a manuscript for an extended period of time, please click "Modify Unavailability Dates" on the bottom of your home page. Enter in the date ranges for the appropriate month(s) and click "Submit Dates." On the next screen, you must confirm your unavailability dates and again click "Submit Dates" or go back to modify them.

Updating Your Profile

You can change your profile and/or update areas of expertise by selecting Modify Profile/Password, under General Tasks, at the bottom of your home page.

Getting Help

If you need help, click on the help signs



or contact the journal staff.

Copyright ©2001-2014 American Geophysical Union.





