

ENVIRONMENTAL & ENGINEERING GEOSCIENCE
GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPTS
(adapted from Abhijit Basu, GSA Books Editor, Indiana University)
Revised July 2024

Dear Colleague:

Your opinion as a reviewer is a critical part of the scientific publication process. Thank you for your contribution – we know that it requires substantial effort to conduct a meaningful review, and we appreciate your service.

Please read the information below, provided to help you efficiently complete your evaluation.

- E&EG uses the Peer Track web-based system for submitting and reviewing manuscripts.
- Normal review time is one month.
- If you know you will be unable to review a manuscript due to time constraints or because the subject area is outside your expertise, please reply promptly via Peer Track so that we can contact another reviewer. We would greatly appreciate suggestions for other qualified reviewers if you cannot review the manuscript.
- Once you accept a review, if you are unavoidably delayed in completing the task, please inform the editor immediately.
- Please verify/update your contact information.

Most reviewers find that the easiest way to use Peer Track is to:

1. Download and print the merged pdf file of the manuscript. The file has all text, figures, captions, and references.
2. Read the paper and conduct the review, taking notes as needed. We highly suggest using the structure on page 3 to compose your review. This will match the web-review form and will expedite entry of the review on Peer Track.
3. Compose a review document offline using a word processor. Note that the manuscript has both page and line-numbers, allowing comments on specific content.
4. If you use markup/editing tools on pdf or Word files of the manuscript, your identity can be revealed. By default, Peer Track strips off e-editing to maintain anonymity and, therefore, may remove your review comments.
5. If you wish to remain anonymous, do not use markup/editing tools on pdf or Word files of the manuscript. Instead, compose comments as a separate document that can be cut-and-pasted into the review web form or hand-write comments on a print-out of the manuscript and send it as an attachment with your review. This allows us to easily transmit your comments, while retaining your anonymity.
6. Return to the Peer Track website and enter your review. For this step, cutting and pasting from your word processing document is most efficient.
7. Once your review has been submitted, you will receive an acknowledgment by email.

In general, a paper must attain an overall rating of good or better from the reviewers to be accepted provisionally for publication. Rate the paper using the following definitions:

- Excellent—well-organized, well-written, well-illustrated paper with outstanding scientific/technical merit
- Very good—well-organized paper with strong scientific/technical merit that needs some rewriting or better illustrations.
- Good—well-written paper with scientific/technical merit that needs some reorganization or better illustrations.

- Fair—paper with some scientific/technical merit that needs significant reorganization, rewriting and/or better illustrations.
- Poor—poorly organized, poorly written paper with little or no scientific/technical merit

Please consider the following in your review:

- Data quality is of paramount importance.
- Make sure that the conclusions are justified based on the data presented and existing knowledge.
- Require scientific integrity in the manuscript.
- Check that all ideas and information that are not common knowledge are appropriately referenced.
- When the idea is to build upon previous studies, the manuscript in review must put its findings in the context of previous research.
- If the research is completely new, all theories and positions must be thoroughly explained or addressed.
- Point out good information and insights as well as weak points.
- Make specific suggestions to improve the paper's readability and clarity.
- Point out jargon and terms that may be unknown to the general reader.
- Authors will appreciate specific helpful writing suggestions. However, do not feel compelled to rewrite a poorly composed paper.
- Read the manuscript more than once. Your perspective may change with additional reading of the manuscript.
- Think about your reactions and comments before submitting the review.
- Keep in mind that some authors may have had financial or other constraints on their research.
- Suggest another approach if you know one, but do not insist that it is the only possible one.
- Support and justify all of your comments and recommendations by elaborating on your ideas or providing examples.
- It is more helpful to the author(s) when you suggest changes if you also explain why and how to incorporate them.
- Take a wide perspective in your review in addition to paying attention to specifics.
- Papers published in E&EG should have broad appeal.
- Remember that authors are our peers. Respectful, constructive criticism will be well-received, whereas personal attacks are unprofessional and unproductive.
- The common goal of authors, reviewers, and editors is to present important research in the best manner possible.

Final acceptance requires that the author(s) must satisfactorily address any criticisms or recommendations for revisions made by the reviewers. This most often entails a re-review of the manuscript to ascertain that your concerns have been addressed.

Additional information, suggestions, and advice for peer reviewers on writing fair and objective reviews of manuscripts may be found in:

DEPINTO, J. V., 1995, Open Letter to JGLR Reviewers: *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 1-2, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330\(95\)71015-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330(95)71015-2).

WASER, N. M., PRICE, M. V. AND GROSBERG, R. K., 1992, Writing an Effective Manuscript Review: *BioScience*, Vol. 42, No. 8, pp. 621-623, doi: 10.2307/1311927.

We sincerely appreciate your support of Environmental and Engineering Geoscience.

Thomas Oommen, Co-Editor, University of Mississippi
Eric Peterson, Co-Editor, Illinois State University

Suggested format to compose reviews.
(this format will allow easy copy/paste into the web form)

Please answer the following questions by pasting in text:

- Can parts of the text be replaced by figures and/or summary tables?
- Can any of the illustrations be reduced in size, combined, eliminated, or significantly improved?
- Are any additional illustrations needed?
- If this paper ranks low, could it be made into a top-quality paper? If so, how?
- Detailed remarks for Authors (The Author will be sent these comments.)
- Confidential Remarks to Scientific Editor (Author will not see these)

Answer these questions by pull-down menus:

- Does the paper contain new and original principles, concepts, methods, or a case history?
- Are the data available sufficient to justify the interpretations and conclusions?
- Are facts clearly separated from interpretations?
- Is the paper well organized?
- Is the paper clearly written?
- Has any part of the paper been published previously, or is it part of another manuscript?
- Does this paper need to be shortened in any way?
- Can you suggest any improvement(s) in the title and/or abstract?
- Will this paper be of interest to the readers of this journal?
- How do you rate this manuscript?
- On the basis of your review, recorded above, should this paper be published by E&EG following any necessary revisions?

Your review is valuable to us even if you cannot, or do not, answer all questions.

Thank you very much for your time in preparing constructive review comments and suggestions for improving the manuscript.