

Interactive comment on “Methodological Considerations in Cover-Collapse Sinkhole Analyses: A Case Study of Southeastern China’s Guangzhou City” by Long Jia et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 19 March 2020

Dear editor and authors, I have reviewed manuscript NHESS-2020-53 entitled “Methodological Considerations in Cover-Collapse Sinkhole Analyses: A Case Study of Southeastern China’s Guangzhou City” and submitted by Long Jia et al., to Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences. Discussions.

I must make reference that when reading the manuscript, I thought that it was a re-submission for this journal, as I reviewed this manuscript before. Reading manuscript many subjects seemed to me that authors was repeating the same mistakes that previously I pointed out and authors did not follow.

After this, I have looked for my previous review at this journal, and I have not found

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



it. Looking at my email I have found that my review of this manuscript was carried out some months ago for Geomorphology journal from Elsevier.

Considering that many of my objections, I should consider the main part, have not been included or incorporated in the manuscript, I must recommend rejection of the manuscript.

We, as reviewers, invert our time in evaluating manuscripts and articles expecting the same ethics than when we, as authors, submit a manuscript. The time inverted from reviewers to develop a review it is expected to improve manuscript, give recommendations to authors and build science between the whole community.

When someone invert his/her time in this subject and notice that nothing from the carried out work has been considered, this produces a significant lack of honesty from authors. I believe that the decision of such behavior should be direct rejection, however if authors want to perform the preparation of a new manuscript version, they have my previous review to perform the preparation of the manuscript.

I started to write the detailed review to the manuscript, as I have referenced before, because I considered as a resubmission, but the identification of the same problems that I thought I have been recommended to correct and authors have not considered, has made that I have stopped to continue with the review.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-53>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

