The Geological Curator: Journal Policy and Guidelines

Aims and Scope
The Geological Curator publishes articles on hypothesis-driven studies which contribute novel results and/or perspectives of relevance to the care and management of geological collections and their use in teaching and engagement. We are particularly interested in publishing articles which are practical, topical and applicable to geological collections across the world.

About the Journal
The Geological Curator is the official journal of the Geological Curators’ Group (GCG) and has been published by the GCG since its first issue in 1974.

There are two issues per year: in June and December, available in both electronic and print format. The most recent content (last two years) is available to GCG members only (https://www.geocurator.org/membership). Funding for the publication is derived from GCG income (primarily membership fees). Issues older than two years are freely available from the GCG website (www.geocurator.org) via a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International Public Licence (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/). Attribution should follow standard academic format, with the Author(s) and year and link to a full reference.

Editorial Board
Editor: Pip Brewer, Natural History Museum, London.
Associate Editor: Lu Allington-Jones, Natural History Museum, London.
The Editorial Board consists of experts in their field, with experience in publishing first-authored papers in high quality peer-reviewed journals.

The Editor is also a committee member of The Geological Curators’ Group (GCG). The position is held for a maximum of three consecutive years. Changes to the journal policies are subject to majority approval by the GCG committee if submitted as a formal proposal by the current editor.

Please note that editorial decisions regarding individual submissions are based on the quality of submissions and appropriate peer review, without political, financial, or personal influences from the GCG committee.

**Book reviews**

Book reviews contain informed opinions about recently published books of particular relevance to geology in museums. The Editor welcomes suggestions of suitable titles for review, and unsolicited reviews (of 500 words maximum) can be accepted at his/her discretion. Publishers should submit books for review to the Editor (journal@geocurator.org).

**Author Fees**

Authors will not be charged for article processing or publishing. Two pages of colour for every 10 printed pages will be free of charge. Above this, authors will be charged £10 per page of colour. There are no restrictions on colour requirements for digital only copies of articles.

**Advertisement charges**

Full A4 page: £80 per issue / Half A4 page: £60 per issue / Quarter A4 page: £40 per issue

25% discount for space bought in three or more issues. Please discuss options with the Editor. Inserts such as publishers’ ‘flyers’ can be mailed with issues of *The Geological Curator* for a fee of £80 per issue (negotiable). 300 copies of any insert should be sent to the Editor.
Article Submission and Publication Process

All submissions should be sent to journal@geocurator.org and should follow the author guidelines (https://www.geocurator.org/journal). They should be in English, appropriately structured, clear and concise and fully referenced. Copies of similar published papers or unpublished manuscripts which are under consideration or in press at other journals must be included in the submission.

At the submission stage, authors are encouraged to suggest potential reviewers. However, these suggestions may not be followed. Authors may also ask to exclude a limited number of named individuals as reviewers, if there is a justifiable conflict of interest. The decision of the Editorial Team is final.

Initial submissions will be reviewed by the Editor who will make an initial assessment as to whether the manuscript is within scope and meets the above criteria. Manuscripts may be rejected at this stage. If accepted for review, they will be forwarded to the appropriate Associate Editor who will guide the author and reviewers through the review process.

The peer-review process is double-blind, unless reviewers state they are happy for their names/details to be shared with authors.

Reviewers should provide a short paragraph describing the main aims and conclusions of the manuscript as well as a recommendation to either accept the manuscript as is, request minor corrections, request major corrections or to recommend rejecting the manuscript. The reviewer should justify their recommendation using evidence from the manuscript and published works. Suggested changes and corrections can be marked on the review form or a copy of the manuscript. Reviewers are expected to be courteous, honest, relevant and professional and to return reviews on time.

In cases where the reviewers are happy to be known to the authors, the latter may contact the reviewers for further clarification if required.
The Associate Editor will liaise with reviewers and the corresponding author to ensure the reviews are of sufficient quality and to ensure reviews are completed in a timely manner. They will review the comments and recommendations of the reviewers and make their own recommendation to the Editor. The final decision regarding the manuscript will be made by the Editor and submitted directly to the corresponding author.

Post-review, a final version of the manuscript should be sent by the corresponding author to the Associate Editor accompanied by a detailed discussion of all changes made as requested, or providing a reasonable explanation as to why specified changes have not been made. The Associate Editor will liaise with the corresponding author, conferring with the Editor as necessary, to ensure that the manuscript can be accepted. The manuscript may need to be returned to the corresponding author if changes still need to be made. At this stage, the Associate Editor will perform a final check ensuring that the manuscript does not contain any areas of confusion or error. If the reviewers recommended major revision, the manuscript should be returned to the reviewers (if willing to review the revised version, otherwise additional reviewers should be sought) for a further review. Once satisfied, the Associate Editor should forward the final manuscript, with high resolution versions of all accompanying figures at the correct size, to the Editor, who will contact the corresponding author to say that the manuscript is accepted and the projected publication date.

During the proof and formatting stage, the corresponding author may be contacted by the Editor and/or the Production Assistant should it be necessary to make minor typographical changes to the manuscript. Final decisions such as these lie with the Editorial Team.

If an author wishes to appeal a decision following peer review, they may make a single appeal directly to the Editor, with clear reasons for the appeal. This will be carefully considered and the decision communicated to the complainant within 3 months. Details of the appeal and the decision will be kept on file. No further appeals can be made.

**Author Considerations and Responsibilities**

The definition of what constitutes an author follows the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2020). Each author of an article must meet all four of the following criteria:
• Have made substantial contributions to the conceptions or design of the work, or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work
• Drafted the work or revised it critically for important intellectual content
• Approved the final version to be published
• Agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Any individuals who have contributed to the work but do not fulfil all four of the above criteria should be acknowledged. The collaborators, not the editors, are responsible for who is listed as an author and the order in which they are listed. This should be decided before initial submission of the manuscript to the journal.

A single corresponding author should be nominated through agreement of all authors and that corresponding authors agrees to the following:

• They will be solely responsible for liaising with the Editorial Team regarding the submission
• They will ensure that all authors are aware of and agree to the submission of the manuscript
• They will ensure that all of the journal’s administrative requirements are met including providing details of authorship and affiliations and disclosures of relationships and activities are properly completed and reported
• They are available throughout the process to answer editorial queries in a timely way
• They agree to keep all authors fully informed of the progress of their submission and to ensure that all authors have had sufficient opportunities to contribute to the development of the manuscript
• They will ensure all authors are in agreement to the final form of the manuscript and agree to and are aware of its final submission
• They agree to the publication of their email address and are available to respond to enquiries and critical reviews of the work post-publication, including requests for additional information.

Competing Interests
All competing interests must be declared at submission. These may or may not be financial, but could be perceived as having influenced the objective presentation of facts and the conclusions within a manuscript. Reviewers and members of the Editorial Team must also immediately on receipt of a manuscript declare any competing interests directly to the Editor, who will evaluate the response required. A statement regarding competing interests must be made at submission (ideally on the manuscript, but acceptable in the covering letter/email), even if the authors are declaring no competing interests. Funding sources must be listed in the acknowledgements.

**Corrections to Published Articles**

If an important error is made which affects the publication record or the integrity of the research or the reputation of one or more of the authors, a correction will be published in the next issue after it has been identified and the correction agreed upon. Minor errors which do not satisfy these criteria will not be published. If additional information is deemed by the Editor to be crucial to the understanding of an article, it may be subsequently published as Addenda.

In cases where the results of a study are shown to be invalid due to information coming to light subsequent to the article’s publication, the article may be retracted. The significance of the effect on the results and conclusions (and hence the final decision) will be judged by the Editor who may seek advice from reviewers. All authors must agree to this and sign a statement confirming their agreement to retract the article.

**Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is the unacknowledged copying of another’s work (text or ideas) or misrepresentation of their work as your own. Plagiarism will not be accepted in The Geological Curator. Please ensure that quotes are minimised and are clearly referenced. Over-use of chunks of text (even if marked as quotations) are not acceptable. All sources should be clearly cited. If they are not cited, the implication is that they are novel ideas/information. If this is not the case, this is considered plagiarism. In some cases, facts or statements are so widely held that it is not necessary to reference them. For these, the recommendations of the editorial team must be followed.
Allegations of Misconduct
Identification or allegations of misconduct either with the research or the review process will be treated seriously. All allegations should be made directly to the Editor who will treat the allegation with confidentiality. The Editor will investigate the allegation, seeking further advice as required. In serious cases, a retraction will be necessary and/or referred to the appropriate institution.

Confidentiality
All submissions and correspondence with the authors are considered confidential. Access to this data is restricted to the editorial team and to the GCG committee chair and webmaster. Personalised data is removed from the submissions prior to peer review. Authors must treat all communication with the editorial board as confidential. Reviewers’ reports and correspondence with reviewers should not be released without the explicit permission of the Editor.
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