

Article 1. Purpose

The Rules are designed to specify matters related to the review of manuscripts submitted to GEO DATA of GeoAI Data Society (hereinafter referred to as the “Society”).

Article 2. Reception

1. GEO DATA shall basically receive manuscripts that are related to the GEO DATA’s areas of research. The Editor-in-Chief (hereinafter referred to as “EiC”) may refuse to receive the submitted manuscript, if it is not related to the GEO DATA’s areas of research or has not fulfilled the requirements.
2. The manuscript may be submitted and received in other ways so long as the EiC approves it.

Article 3. Selection of Reviewers

The Editorial Board (hereinafter referred to as the “EB”) receives and reviews manuscripts from authors who wish to publish their work in accordance with the ‘Rules for Submitting and Publishing Manuscripts in GEO DATA’.

1. Submitted manuscripts will be reviewed by the EiC, and assigned to the editor by specialty.
2. The editor will select two reviewers who are suitable for the specialty of the submitted article and request the review within 7 days from the date of receipt.
3. If the assigned reviewers are unavailable, they will recommend another reviewer within 7 days from the date of notification.
4. The editor shall, in principle, exclude reviewers who are affiliated with the same institution as the authors.
5. When officers and EB submit manuscripts, the anonymity, fairness, and security of the appointment of reviewers shall be more thoroughly maintained.

Article 4. Confidentiality

The review of submitted manuscripts is single-blind review, which means that only the reviewers are anonymous. Reviewers know the authors’ names and backgrounds, but authors don’t know those of the reviewers.

Article 5. Review Period

1. The reviewer who receives the review request shall notify the review result online within 21 days from the date of receipt of the review request.
2. If the review result is not submitted within the deadline, the review request may be dismissed.

Article 6. Review Procedure

Following the comprehensive review of the manuscripts, the reviewer shall record results of the review supported with objective grounds and make the clear request for revision, if necessary.

1. Is the topic appropriate for publication in GEO DATA?
 2. Is the manuscript and data technically correct?
 3. Has the data been assigned a DOI?
 4. In which repository is the data stored for sharing and reuse?
 5. Is the manuscript convincing, and if not, does it require additional evidence?
 6. Is the manuscript’s logic sufficiently supported by experimental data?
 7. Is the statistical analysis of the data valid?
 8. Does the data availability conform to the expected standards of the research community?
 9. Does the author create the Data Availability Statement?
 10. Does the manuscript contribute to the published knowledge of the field?
 11. Is the context of the references adequately addressed in the manuscript’s arguments?
-

-
12. If the manuscript cannot be accepted in its current form, does the research appear promising enough to encourage the author to consider a future resubmission?
 13. Is the manuscript written clearly and understandably, and if not, how could readability be improved?
 14. Are there any special ethical issues arising from the involvement of animals or human subjects?

Article 7. Decision

1. A reviewer shall submit a grade judgment of 'Accept', 'Minor', 'Major', 'Reject' based on the evaluation item list for the manuscript requested for review, as well as the review comments and revision requirements if necessary. The criteria for each judgment are as follows.
2. **Accept:** A manuscript that can be published without revision or a manuscript that is recommended to be revised due to partial deficiencies in the content or system of the manuscript, and the author can decide whether or not to revise the manuscript in response to the reviewers' revision recommendation.
3. **Minor:** A manuscript that requires substantial revision in the content or system of the manuscript, and the author must revise it according to the revision request of the reviewers, and the editor in charge can decide whether to revise it and the reasonableness of the revision.
4. **Major:** A manuscript whose content or system is very vague or insufficient, and the author must revise the reviewer's request for revision, and the revised manuscript must be re-examined by the reviewer.
5. **Reject:** Manuscripts with the following disqualifying reasons
 - Plagiarizing the contents of already published articles without evidence
 - The procedure and method of data collection are not clear
 - Manuscripts that are not significantly different from already published data
 - Manuscripts that are significantly different from the scope and field of the manuscript
 - Manuscripts with inadequate narrative or logical organization

- Manuscripts that do not conform to the system and format of this journal
6. The evaluation opinions of the reviewers will be notified to the authors and will not be disclosed to anyone other than the authors.
 7. If the reviewer intends to resubmit a manuscript that has been judged unacceptable for publication, a new submission will be accepted after substantial revision. In this case, the principle is to appoint two new reviewers other than the previous reviewers.
 8. If the reviewer determines that the English abstract needs to be revised, it may be requested to be revised by a professional English Editor.
 9. If the manuscript cannot be published due to plagiarism or other reasons, or if it has already been published, we will decide to withdraw it.

Article 8. Revision

1. The author of a manuscript that has received a recommendation for revision must revise the manuscript according to the reviewers' revisions and submit a response and revised version to the online submission system.
2. If the revised version is not received within 90 days after requesting the author to revise the article without any special reason, the review may be terminated without publishing the article.

Article 9. Decision on Publication

The final decision on whether to publish an article shall be made by the EB on the comprehensive evaluation of the editor based on the review results of the two reviewers.

Article 10. Appeals

1. Author may exchange opinions with the reviewers anonymously through the mediation of the EB regarding the contents of the submission and the results of the review.
 2. The reviewers shall respond in good faith to any comments made by the reviewer regarding the review through the EB.
-

Article 11. Publication

1. If publication is confirmed as a result of the review, the EIC shall request the final version of the manuscript reflecting the 'Rules for Submitting and Publishing Manuscripts in GEO DATA' from the contributor and publish the final version received.
2. In principle, the order of publication shall be determined based on the subject area and the date of publication confirmation.

Article 12. Review Fee

If necessary, a small editorial fee may be paid to the EB, and a small review fee may be paid to the reviewers.

Supplementary Provisions**Article 1. Enforcement Date**

(Enacted December 1, 2019) This regulation shall come into effect on the date of promulgation.

(Amended April 14, 2023) This regulation shall come into effect as amended on April 14, 2023.
