

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on The Equator Project Research School and Mentoring Network: evaluated interventions to improve equity in geoscience research

Original Research, Earth Sci. Syst. Soc.

Reviewer: Alberto Montanari

Submitted on: 10 May 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/esss.2024.10123

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

I think the study is a very important contribution to improve equity in geoscience research. It reports an experience from a project focusing on ethnic diversity in geosciences. In particular, it reports the outcome from a discipline-specific and ring-fenced research school.

The main finding is that the ring-fenced, discipline-specific and fully funded nature of the intervention are key to success. I believe these conclusions are extremely interesting, although referred to the specific context of UK domiciled students.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

In my opinion, the main limitation is the reference of the specific context of UK. I believe South of Europe, for instance, is very different. I personally was convinced, before reviewing the paper, that another limitation of the study was the ring-fenced setting of the initiative. After reading and reviewing, however, I got convinced that this actually is the main strength of the contribution. I personally believe that ring-fencing may prevent reaching inclusivity. However, the results of the paper provide an interesting view of the opposite interpretation. Overall, I think this experience is VERY significant and the paper worth publishing.

#### **Q 3** Please comment on the methods, results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

I am pleased to say that I don't have major remarks on the paper, the presentation of the results and the framework of the analysis. I made some minor comments in the attached annotated manuscript.

#### **Q 4** Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes.

If relevant, are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

Yes.

Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository? (Sequence/expression data, protein/molecule characterizations, annotations, and taxonomy data are required to be deposited in public repositories prior to publication)

Yes.

Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?

Yes.

If relevant, have standard biosecurity and institutional safety procedures been adhered to?

Yes.

**Q 5** Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

Please see minor additional comments in the attached file.

The only additional and minor comment that I would like to make here is that the paper is very long. As such, I think it may generate fatigue in the reader who may then not be able to distill the message. I would suggest to consider shortening some parts, if possible.

Congratulations on a very interesting experience and publication.

Alberto Montanari

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

|   |                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Q 6</b> Originality                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Q 7</b> Rigor                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Q 8</b> Significance to the field      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| <b>Q 9</b> Interest to a general audience | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| <b>Q 10</b> Quality of the writing        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Q 11</b> Overall quality of the study  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |