
Guide for Authors and Reviewers

All manuscripts submitted to JGSK are reviewed confidentially by the editorial board members and qualified reviewers. A unique reference number is assigned to each manuscript and this number should be used to refer to the manuscript in any subsequent communications between the corresponding author and the editor or the Editorial Office. The reviewers are expected to uphold the Guidelines for Reviewers and complete their reviews as soon as possible. The corresponding author is generally notified of the editor's decision to accept, reject, or require revision of the submitted manuscript by the Editorial Office within 4 weeks from the initial submission. The authors should submit the Authors' Checklist and Response to the Reviewers along with the revised manuscript. Manuscripts that have been rejected or withdrawn may be resubmitted if the major criticisms have been properly addressed.

1. Editors are accountable and should take responsibility of everything they publish.
2. Editors should ensure a fair and appropriate peer review process and make fair and unbiased decisions based on the peer reviews without being affected by commercial consideration.
3. Editors should adopt editorial policies that encourage maximum transparency and complete and honest reporting.
4. Editors should guard the integrity of the published record by issuing corrections and retractions when needed and properly handle suspected or alleged research and publication misconduct.
5. Editors should monitor and properly handle reviewer and editorial misconduct.
6. Editors should critically assess whether studies on humans and animals have met the ethical standards.
7. Editors should provide peer reviewers and authors with explicit instructions on the journal's expectations for the scope, content and quality of reviews and manuscripts.
8. Editors should have appropriate policies in place for handling editorial conflicts of interest.

Instructions to Reviewers

Section 1. Principles of Review

The review of manuscripts submitted to "Journal of Geological Society of Korea JGSK" should be objective, equitable and all the manuscripts must be assessed under the common review guidelines.

Section 2. Importance of Fair Review

To enhance the quality of the JGSK, all the manuscripts must be reviewed strictly in terms of their merits.

Section 3. Timeliness of Review

Rapid editing is essential for timely publication of the journal. All reviews are to be completed within one month. In case of an express article, the review shall be completed within a week. An extra fee will be charged to an accepted express article but the express article is not indicated separately.

Section 4. Review Criteria

The review of the manuscript assesses whether the conclusions were reached based on the presented data and their interpretations according to consistent and objective reasoning. Reviewers are to focus on whether the research followed reasonable and appropriate procedures, neither on the differences between the opinions of the authors and their own nor on whether they agree on the conclusions.

Section 5. Objective of Review

The objective of a review is to evaluate the merits of a manuscript as well as present the authors on how to supplement or revise the manuscript for improving the quality.

Section 6. Procedure of Review

The Editor-in-Chief will refer directly to the reviewer and the reviewer will send the assessments to the editorial board.

Section 7. Protection of Reviewer

The Editor-in-Chief and editorial board should make every effort to protect the reviewer from possible disputes over the assessments and editorial decisions.

Section 8. Communication with Reviewers

In principle, communication between the editorial board and reviewers is to be done by e-mail, but the Editor-in-Chief and editorial board can communicate with the reviewers by telephone to facilitate the process.

Review Checklist

Checklist	Yes			No		
1. Title: Does it clearly describe the article?	1	2	3			
2. Abstract: Does it summarize the content concisely and clearly?	1	2	3			
3. Introduction: Is the background and theme of the thesis clearly explained?	1	2	3			
4. Main Text: Does it present details for understanding the results?	1	2	3			
5. Results and Discussion: Have the conclusions reached a data reasonable interpretation and a sufficient review?	1	2	3			
6. Reference: Are citations accurate? Are recent references being cited?	1	2	3			
7. Is the article's structure suitable for the journal?	1	2	3			
8. Is the length of the article appropriate?	1	2	3			
9. Are all the figures and tables necessary?	1	2	3			
10. Does it fully reflect the results of previous related studies?	1	2	3			
11. Do any sentences need to be improved?	1	2	3			
12. Is the article suitable for the Journal of Geological Society of Korea?	1	2	3			