PEER-REVIEW FORM

Article title

1. **Nature and novelty of the article**
2. Is the article appropriate for the journal in terms of its subject matter and methodological approach?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If your answer is “No”, please provide a brief explanation

1. The article…

[ ]  provides new data and information and/or new ideas

[ ]  proposes new methodologies or techniques

[ ]  is a useful review or compendium

[ ]  does not provide a significant contribution or add substantial novelty to the current literature.

If other, please specify:

1. Is the scientific contribution clearly indicated in the text?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

1. **Content and structure of the article**
2. The scientific approach of the work (introduction, hypothesis, objectives, etc) is:

[ ]  appropriate

[ ]  too brief

[ ]  too long

[ ]  inappropriate

If other, please specify:

1. Is the article structured in a logical and accurate order?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If needed, possible recommendations in this regard are:

1. The calculations, methods and statistical techniques used are:

[ ]  suitable

[ ]  the question does not apply to this article

[ ]  erroneous, debatable, perfectible, etc

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. The cartographic treatment (graphic expression, adequacy of projections, symbolization and scales, presence of an scale bar and coordinates in grids or edges, clear images, etc) is:

[ ]  suitable

[ ]  the question does not apply to this article

[ ]  absent, erroneous, debatable, perfectible, captions and/or legends are missing, etc

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. Graphs and figures (excluding maps) are:

[ ]  suitable

[ ]  the question does not apply to this article

[ ]  erroneous, insufficient, dispensable, perfectible, footers and/or legends are missing, etc

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. The study area:

[ ]  is adequately indicated

[ ]  the question does not apply to this article

[ ]  is vaguely or poorly described, etc

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. The temporal dimension of work:

[ ]  is adequately indicated (dates of cartographic sources, field visits, etc)

[ ]  the question does not apply to this article

[ ]  is vaguely or poorly described, etc

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. Materials (of all kinds, including cartographic sources, etc):

[ ]  are suitable and adequately indicated

[ ]  the question does not apply to this article

[ ]  are vaguely or poorly described, etc

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. Results:

[ ]  cover what is expected according to the hypotheses, objectives and methodology of the work

[ ]  the question does not apply to this article

[ ]  are insufficient, erroneous, inconsistent, excessively detailed, perfectible, etc

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. Should any part be enlarged or reduced?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If your answer is “Yes”, please provide a brief explanation:

1. The conclusions are:

[ ]  very relevant

[ ]  interesting

[ ]  of little interest, irrelevant or non-existent

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. Bibliographical references are:

[ ]  very relevant

[ ]  interesting

[ ]  of little interest, irrelevant or non-existent

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

#### C. Formal aspects

1. The language used is:

[ ]  correct and clear

[ ]  correct but unclear

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

1. Article title

[ ]  respond to its content

[ ]  should be modified or changed

Proposal for a new title, in the event that it should be modified or changed:

1. The summary is:

[ ]  appropriate

[ ]  too short

[ ]  too long

[ ]  inappropriate

Suggestions:

1. Keywords are:

[ ]  suitable

[ ]  insufficient

[ ]  excessive

[ ]  inadequate

Keyword suggestions, in case they are not suitable:

1. Bibliographic references:

[ ]  present a suitable format for GeoFocus

[ ]  need a review

If you have selected the last option, please justify your answer:

##### Comments and suggestions for the author

Please provide, using additional sheets if necessary, and in any form and length as appropriate, the key aspects, areas for improvement, and points of critique. Additionally, you may include margin comments directly in the same document submitted by the authors, as well as changes with the Word tracking changes function.

It is strongly recommended that, in the case the article is not considered acceptable, the reasons for such a decision be clearly informed if they have not been clearly stated in the previous sections, so that they can be communicated to the authors.
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**IMPORTANT! Do not sign** this or the separate sheets to ensure the confidentiality of the procedure.