Tektonika peer-review form

> This form is **mandatory**, but highly flexible.

> We encourage reviewers to read the guidance below and familiarise themselves with the form's content before starting the review.

> An annotated version of the manuscript may be uploaded as part of the review.

We remind reviewers that by accepting to review a manuscript for Tektonika, you agree to abide by our Code of Conduct. No regard should be given to gender, race, age, career stage, ethnic origin or citizenship, religious belief, or political or scientific alignment of the Author(s). All reviews should be respectful to the author(s) and unacceptable behaviours will not be tolerated.

This review form aims to streamline Tektonika's peer-review process and provide a structure that supports constructive feedback to authors. It is meant to guide unambiguous comments by reviewers on different aspects of the manuscript, facilitate revision and response by the authors, and swift and fair decisions by the editors. This form contains the following sections:

A - Overall evaluation

      A1 Overall evaluation, general comments and summary

      A2 Main merits, and main points of improvement

B - Detailed evaluation

      B1 Title and abstract

      B2 Introduction

      B3 Datasets and methods

      B4 Results

      B5 Discussion and conclusions

      B6 Figures, tables and citations

C - Additional comments

D - Feedback (about this review form)

Within each form section, the form has three subsections.

(i) For reviewers: YES/NO statements to evaluate manuscript *form*

YES/NO in statements aimed at qualifying the submission clarity in presenting the research (e.g. clear structure, effective knowledge transfer). The statements may also be used as prompts for structuring reviewer comments.

(ii) For reviewers: Free-form text to evaluate manuscript *content*

Comments on scientific merit, originality and validity of the research presented, and its relevance to the journal's scope.

(iii) For authors: Free-form text to answer reviewers' comments

Authors should answer all reviewers' comments, point-by-point, including submitted and modified versions of text passages, and any other relevant information to allow assessing how reviewers' comments have been addressed.

In addition, both authors and reviewers may provide feedback to Tektonika about this form, and the overall peer-review process using section D (or by email, to jtektonika@gmail.com).

Reviewers must complete section A, and are strongly encouraged to fill section B, specially for first submissions (see examples below). Sections C-D may be completed at reviewers' discretion.

Examples on how to fill section B "as needed":

- Should research be presented with insufficient clarity for the reviewer to easily assess its quality, reviewers may choose to answer to YES/NO statements only, and provide small comments to help improve the manuscript's clarity or structure.

- Should research be clearly and effectively communicated, reviewers may choose to review exclusively the manuscript's scientific content (merit, originality, validity and relevance), using the free text boxes predominantly while skipping or answering only a few of the YES/NO statements.

Section A: Overview of manuscript

A1) Overall evaluation, general comments & summary

A1.1) Reviewer's comments

A1.1.1) General evaluation and publication suggestion – Required:
Please use this space to describe, in your own words, the core subject of the submission and your overall assessment of its suitability for publication.

[Free form box]

A1.1.2) What does the submission need to be publishable? (select as needed; comment for all cases)

- ☐ No changes required
- ☐ Rewriting
- ☐ Reorganising
- ☐ More data/figures
- ☐ Condensing
- ☐ Reinterpretation
- ☐ Other

Comments:

[Free form box]

A1.1.3) Can the submission be improved by reducing/adding any of the following? (select as needed; comment for all cases)

- ☐ Text
- ☐ Table
- ☐ Figures
- ☐ Supplementary material

Comments:

[Free form box]

A1.1.4) Please complete the following section if you recommend that the submission is NOT appropriate for publication (select as needed; comment if a box is selected)

☐ Quality is poor
☐ Research is not reproducible
☐ Other

Comments:

[Free form box]

A1.2) Author(s) Responses:

A2) Summary of main merits and main points of improvement

A2.1) Reviewer's comments
Please describe below in a few sentences (100 to 300 words) the main merits of the submission and suggestions for improvements.

The main merits I have found are...

[Free form box]

The main points of improvement I have found are...

[Free form box]

A2.2) Author's responses:

[Free form box]

Section B: Detailed evaluation of manuscript

B1) Title and abstract

B1.1) Reviewer's comments
*These statements are a **guide** to what good* Titles *and* Abstracts include*. Please select YES or NO to the statements below if you wish and detail in the free form box below your reasons for any box checked with NO, or to comment on any other matter.*

The *Title* describes the main topic of the manuscript **accurately** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Title* describes the main topic of the manuscript **succinctly** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Title* includes **appropriate key terms** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Abstract* includes a **clear aim and rationale** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Abstract* supports the rationale with **sufficient background information** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Abstract* includes a **well-balanced description of the methods** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Abstract* describes the **main results sufficiently and adequately** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Abstract* clearly describes the **importance/impact of the study** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Abstract* clearly states the **conclusions of the study** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Abstract* is **clear** and **well structured** — [YES] / [NO]

Comments:

[Free form box]

B1.2) Author's responses

[Free form box]

B2) Introduction

B2.1) Reviewer's comments

*These statements are a **guide** to what good Introductions include. Please select YES or NO to the statements below if you wish and detail in the free form box below your reasons for any box checked with NO, or to comment on any other matter.*

The *Introduction* provides **sufficient background and context** for the study — [YES] / [NO]

The *Introduction* describes the **aim/hypothesis/rationale** clearly, providing **sufficient context** — [YES] / [NO]

The *objective/hypothesis/rationale* **flows logically from the background** information — [YES] / [NO]

The *Introduction* describes the study's **objective and approach** (last paragraph) — [YES] / [NO]

The *Introduction* contains **relevant, suitable citations** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Introduction* is **organized effectively** — [YES] / [NO]

Comments:

[Free form box]

B2.2) Author's responses

[Free form box]

B3) Data and methods

B3.1) Reviewer's comments

*These statements are a **guide** to what good* Method *sections include and good practices for* Dataset *accessibility. Please select YES or NO to the statements below if you wish and detail in the free form box below your reasons for any box checked with NO, or to comment on any other matter.*

The *Methods* are described **concisely and with enough detail** for reproducibility — [YES] / [NO]

Necessary information about **data sources/acquisition/processing** is included — [YES] / [NO]

Data used are accessible via either supplementary files or links in the data availability statement — [YES] / [NO]

The *Dataset and/or Methods* are **organized effectively** — [YES] / [NO]

Comments:

[Free form box]

B3.2) Author's responses

[Free form box]

B4) Results

B4.1) Reviewer's comments

*These statements are a **guide** to what good Result sections include. Please select YES or NO to the statements below if you wish and detail in the free form box below your reasons for any box checked with NO, or to comment on any other matter.*

The *Results* findings are **supported by data** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Results* findings are presented **clearly and succinctly** — [YES] / [NO]

The text in the *Result* section **cites tables and figures appropriately** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Results* directly **relate to the study objectives** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Results* present **data for all the approaches** described in the *Methods* section — [YES] / [NO]

The *Results* **text belongs to the Results section**, not to *Introduction*, *Methods*, or *Discussion.* — [YES] / [NO]

The *Results* section is **organised effectively** — [YES] / [NO]

Comments:

[Free form box]

B4.2) Author's responses

[Free form box]

B5) Discussion and conclusions

B5.1) Reviewer's comments

*These statements are a **guide** to what good* Discussions *and* Conclusions *include. Please select YES or NO to the statements below if you wish and detail in the free form box below your reasons for any box checked with NO, or to comment on any other matter.*

The *Discussion* is **focused on the objectives** of the study — [YES] / [NO]

The *Discussion* **addresses all major results** of this study, which are shown in *Results* — [YES] / [NO]

The *Discussion* section makes **comparisons with other studies** that are relevant and informative — [YES] / [NO]

The *Discussion* section properly identifies all **speculative statements** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Discussion* section presents the **implications of the study** persuasively — [YES] / [NO]

The *Discussion* section **highlights novel contributions** appropriately — [YES] / [NO]

The *Discussion* section **addresses the limitations** of the study appropriately — [YES] / [NO]

The *Discussion* section is **organised effectively** — [YES] / [NO]

The *Conclusions* are **consistent** with and **summarise** the rest of the manuscript — [YES] / [NO]

The *Conclusions* are **supported by the data** in *Results* and **follow logically** from the *Discussion* — [YES] / [NO]

The *Conclusions* are **clear and concise** — [YES] / [NO]

Comments:

[Free form box]

B5.2) Author's responses

[Free form box]

B6) Figures, tables and citations

B6.1) Reviewer's comments

*These statements are a **guide** to what good* Figures *and* Tables *include and how they are presented. Please select YES or NO to the statements below if you wish and detail in the free form box below your reasons for any box checked with NO, or to comment on any other matter.*

Tables and *Figures* are **ordered logically** and **numbered sequentially** — [YES] / [NO]

Tables and *Figures* have **captions that explain** all their major features — [YES] / [NO]

Tables and *Figures* have **captions that complement** the information in the main text — [YES] / [NO]

Tables and *Figures* present data that **relate** to the study objective — [YES] / [NO]

Tables and *Figures* present data that are **consistent** with and support the description of results — [YES] / [NO]

Tables and *Figures* have **succinct and informative titles** — [YES] / [NO]

Figures are **accessible** (elements are clearly labelled, accessible colour palettes, colour contrasts, font size legible, etc.…) — [YES] / [NO]
*Please, check our [*Figure guidelines*]*

Figures with **maps or cross-sections** contain all **elements to be understood** (north arrow orientation, scale, visible coordinates, sufficient coordinate grid intercepts) — [YES] / [NO]

Figures with **maps** have **sufficient location information** (in the map or caption) — [YES] / [NO]

Cross-sections have clear labels for **scale and coordinates** at ends and within-section kinks — [YES] / [NO]

All georeferenced elements are provided in common format (.shp, .geotiff, .kml) [in an open-access repository] — [YES] / [NO]

Citations throughout are relevant, suitable, and comprehensive — [YES] / [NO]

Comments:

[Free form box]

B6.2) Author's responses

[Free form box]

Section C: Additional comments

C1) Minor/line-numbered comments

C1.1) Reviewer's comments

[Free form box]

C1.2) Author's responses

[Free form box]

C2) Other remarks

C2.1) Reviewer's comments

[Free form box]

C2.2) Author's responses

[Free form box]

Section D: Feedback to improve Tektonika's review process

We kindly ask reviewers and authors to provide any feedback that can help improve this review form, or other aspects of the review process.

Feedback can also be emailed at any time to jtektonika@gmail.com