

The primary purpose of the review is to provide the editors with the information needed to reach a decision, while considering especially the audience of the journal. Therefore, the review should follow the three basic steps: (a) relevancy of the theme for GeoScape journal, (b) scientific and innovative value of the manuscript and (c) technical quality of the manuscript. The reviewers are encouraged to provide editors and authors with substantiation of their comments and ideas as well as with recommendations and advices for further improvement of the manuscript (terminology, concepts, references, etc.). The negative review should be explanative to enable authors improve the text.

Title:**Paper ID:**

- (a) Is the theme relevant to the journal scope? (in other case, explain clearly why and do not continue with review process)
- (b) Is the paper innovative enough, does it bring new results, approaches or (re)assessment of former ideas?
- (c) Do the title, abstract and key words match the aim of the paper?
- (d) Are there clearly defined aims followed throughout the manuscript?
- (e) Is the level of theoretical and methodological background appropriate (including references of relevant and up-to-date literature)?
- (f) Are the claims convincing? If not, is it a matter of methodical lacks, or of way they are discussed? What should be done to improve the interpretation?
- (g) Is the manuscript written in good English?
- (h) Are there any graphical components (figures) that would make it easier to understand what the authors are trying to say? What is their quality? Is there any other information that could/should be expressed in figure(s)?
- (i) What other (specific) work can improve the manuscript?

Other comments:

I recommend the paper to be: accepted revised (minor revisions)
 revised (major revisions) rejected

Date:

Name:

Open my name to authors: yes no