

Guide

for the review of manuscripts submitted to Publications in Geomatics

Introduction

The journal was founded in 1998 with the aim of providing researchers, teachers and engineers working in the field of geomatics with the opportunity to publish primarily in Hungarian, in accordance with international standards of content and form. It is the task of both the editorial board and the reviewers to maintain and enforce this high standard. For this reason, manuscripts undergo the usual peer review process before publication, during which the manuscript is given its final content and form. The conscientious and helpful work of the reviewers, with the necessary degree of criticism, plays a key role in this process.

The format of the articles in the journal of Geomatics is now finalised and information on this can be downloaded from www.geomatika.epss.hu. As the members of the editorial team are volunteers, it only has the capacity to make minor formal adjustments to the articles. Although it is essentially the author's responsibility to shape the manuscript according to a given template, the editorial team's work is greatly facilitated by the comments of the reviewers, referring also to the format.

In what follows, however, we will only draw attention to the most important aspects and issues that, if considered and taken into account, can effectively help reviewers to judge the content of manuscripts. These essential points and issues have been formulated on the basis of the experience of editing 26 volumes since the foundation of the journal.

Copyright issues and originality

Although publication in the journal of Geomatics is not yet subject to the legal procedure used by many journals, whereby the author transfers copyright, which mainly concerns the "afterlife" of his article (reprints, market distribution, etc.), to a publisher, the general written and unwritten rules governing publication must be taken into account. These primarily concern originality, i.e. preventing an article from being published in several places with the same content. Of course, the definition of 'the same content' is a difficult task, but we recommend that the following considerations be taken into account.

1) By definition the reviewer is a professional in the field of expertise defined by the subject of the article. That is, she or he is familiar with the relevant literature in the national and foreign languages and is therefore able to assess whether the results published are new. By definition, a new result is one that has not yet been published anywhere.

2) There are, of course, research activities that have been going on for a long time (e.g. geodynamic research, observatory data processing, method development, etc.) and which produce thematically related new results from time to time. For these, the publication should generally refer to the

research history (earlier results), with a proper form of regular and verifiable reference. This does not of course imply republication.

3) In order to protect and develop the Hungarian professional language, journal of Geomatics mainly publishes studies in Hungarian. Unfortunately, scientometry still gives little weight to this, i.e. it forces researchers to publish in foreign languages, mainly in SCI journals with impact factor. However, it is very difficult for the results published in this way to reach the Hungarian professionals, so we consider it acceptable that there can be an overlap of about 50% in the results and content of a foreign language and a Hungarian language publication. Of course, in this case, too, the rules of citation must be observed and the repetition of figures and tables, for example, must be avoided, since they are protected by copyright once they have been published under copyright transfer.

Searching the relevant literature, reference rules

As the number of independent citations that authors receive for their published articles plays a very important role in their scientific metrics, it is in the best interest of our professional community to support each other with citations whenever possible and appropriate. It is therefore an important task for the referee to decide whether the depth of exploration of the relevant literature is sufficient for a given manuscript, and whether the reference list is considered sufficient.

In addition to this, particular attention should be paid to checking the citation rules. Unfortunately, it is becoming increasingly common for authors to cite Internet documents that have not undergone a documented peer review process, and which are sometimes unverifiable and untraceable. This cannot be accepted as a proper citation, just as, for example, a lecture given at a conference cannot be accepted as a proper citation. In other words, only publications that have been made available to the public, either in print or in electronic form, through a peer review process, with the assistance of a responsible publisher, are eligible for inclusion in the "References" list. Digital form means digital journals only.

If the author needs to use a web reference, she/he must do so only by inserting it in the relevant text and providing sufficient explanation, including in brackets the URL used and the date of access to the web page in year-month-day format (see `template_file_of_Publications_in_Geomatics`).

The review procedure and its output documents

The reviewers for a given manuscript are appointed by the editorial board, either on the basis of the author's proposal or on the basis of the author's own ideas. Once the reviewers have been appointed, the invitation is automatically sent by the Internet Manuscript Management System of Publication in Geomatics. By default, the identity of the reviewers is unknown to the author, but any reviewer may disclose her/his identity.

After accepting the request, reviewers must log in to the system within a specified time limit, from where they can download the manuscript. The reviewer will be asked to fill in the summary questions of the review form, which in some cases have logical links. These will be checked by the system and any discrepancies will be alerted. Of course, it is often not possible to give a clear **yes/no** answer to the questions, so the reviewers are given the opportunity to briefly qualify their answers in the text box below the questioner, or to indicate whether they have attached

a more detailed opinion to the review. This is also a text input field to provide the editorial team with information and opinions that they do not wish to disclose to the author.

In addition, the reviewer can use the proofreading tools of either the Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat Professional software packages to annotate and correct the manuscript itself, and/or upload a detailed review in a separate PDF file. A serious review is only considered to be a review that includes at least one of these documents. A formal review (e.g. only filling in the review questioner) does not help either the author or the editorial team and does not contribute to maintaining professional standards.

Extreme Reviewer' Decisions

There are two questions on the questioner—that cannot be accepted without detailed justification. These are, in order of the list:

11) Do you recommend unconditional rejection of the manuscript?

12) Do you recommend publication of the manuscript in its current state?

Yes answers to questions 11) or 12) should be given only with a detailed justification, e.g. for 11): the article has already been published elsewhere, i.e. it does not contain new results; the results are based on incorrect assumptions; the manuscript is not at all in the field of Geomatics, etc...

In case 12), the reviewer considers the manuscript to be perfect and has found errors neither of content nor form or content. The likelihood of the latter is very low in our experience and assumes that the reviewer is as familiar with the formal requirements of Publications of Geomatics as the technical editor of the journal.

Sopron, December 2024

Journal of Geomatics

Editorial Board