



## Peer-Reviewing Format

Dear reviewer,

We recommend you to include in the manuscript's feedback the following information, feel free to modify what you consider necessary.

1. Make a brief comment on the general ideas that resume the chapter.

*Write here your answer...*

2. Make comments on the contribution and say whether it is significant and whether it has sufficient impact on the geology of Colombia.

*Write here your answer...*

3. Originality: Does the chapter contain new and significant information adequate to publish? (consider whether the chapter is original or is reviewing paper, ask the editor-in-chief if further information is required)
4. Is the title attractive? Concise? Enough informative or descriptive? Accurately highlight the content of the chapter?
5. Does the chapter demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?
6. Methodology: Are the chapter's arguments built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the chapter is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate? Is there any comment on the quality of outcrops, samples, data acquisition, etc.?
7. Are results presented clearly and analyzed properly? Do the conclusions adequately tie the other elements of the chapter?
8. Were the conclusions supported by the data?

9. If so, make comments on figures, tables, and supplemental material. Keep in mind that editor-in-chief is particularly interested in publishing a high-quality graphical material.
10. Make comments to terms, if it is necessary.
11. Quality of communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the book's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.?
12. Is the English language clear? Well used? Do you recommend copy editing?
13. Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the chapter. Make your suggestions.

Overall reviewer chapter rating	1	2	3	4	5
1. Readability (1) Unreadable - (5) A pleasure to read					
2. Relevance (1) Trivial - (5) Highly important					
3. Contribution to the subject - (1) Useless - (5) Very useful					
4. Clarity (1) Incomprehensible - (5) Very clear					
5. Quality of the theory (1) Wrong - (5) Very good					
6. Quality of graphic material (1) Very poor- (5) Very good					
7. Correctness of the mathematics (1) Wrong - (5) Correct					
8. Quality of the data (1) Abused - (5) Very well analyzed					
9. Execution of the data analysis (1) Murdered - (5) Well executed					
10. Language (1) Must be strongly revised - (5) It should not be revised					
<b>Total score</b>	/50				

**Final recommendation, the chapter should be...**

1. Accepted with as it is	
---------------------------	--

2. Accepted with few corrections	
3. Accepted after significant corrections	
4. Rejected	

If further revision is required after corrections, we encourage reviewers to make a second revision.

Those notes should be sent to the e-mail [thegeologyofcolombia@sgc.gov.co](mailto:thegeologyofcolombia@sgc.gov.co), the deadline should be \_\_\_\_\_. Nevertheless, we recommend reviewers to send those as earlier as possible.

**Peer reviewer name, filiation, and signature**

Let authors know my name \_\_\_ Do not let authors know my name \_\_\_\_.  
 We encourage reviewers to let the geoscientific community knows their names.

