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Thoughts on a ‘bad’ figure: I really did not like Figure 2(a) from Goettsch et al. 2015 (https://www.nature.com/articles/nplants2015142). I thought that the choice of a black background for North and South America in this figure, in comparison to the green background used in all other figures, was a strange, stark contrast. The absence of any geographic markers, scale, north arrow, or latitudinal or longitudinal information seemed odd for a map figure. Most importantly, it was practically impossible to see the information that the authors were trying to convey. The color scheme used made it hard to identify which locations on the map had which values.

Thoughts on a ‘good’ figure: I really liked Figure 2 from Miller et al. 2019 (https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/2041-210X.13110). The three separate panels in the figure made good use of color to highlight similarities and differences between workflows. The organization of the figures made sense and the choice of font made figures legible. Importantly, the figure served the purpose that it intended: to visually clarify fundamental, yet somewhat abstract, similarities and differences among a suite of modelling approaches.