

Interactive comment on “Geospatial Analysis and Simulation of Glacial Lake Outburst Flood Hazard in Hunza and Shyok Basins of Upper Indus Basin” by Syed Naseem Abbas Gilany et al.

Tobias Bolch (Editor)

tobias.bolch@st-andrews.ac.uk

Received and published: 25 March 2020

Dear Naseem Gilany, dear co-authors,

I have now carefully read the reviews and your replies and also investigated information about academic misconduct. In line with the Copernicus policy and in agreement with the editors in chiefs I decided to reject the manuscript. The reasons are the following:

(1) Both reviewers clearly highlighted several major shortcomings and rated the manuscript quite low. Both also suggested that the manuscript would fit better in a more hazard related journal. The reviews are very much in line with my access review.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



I have a lot of respect for the work of reviewers. Both reviewers would have saved time if my recommendations of the access review would have been followed more in depth. I clearly wrote in my access review: “I encourage you to address the points raised above and resubmit the manuscript either to TC or another journal. At minimum I expect to include more relevant literature and improve the structure.” My recommendations were neither adequately considered nor the structure really improved. Unfortunately, I provided the opportunity to resubmit without an additional review by me.

(2) The following recently published paper has several similar figures and a similarity report shows almost 50% overlap: Gilany, N., Iqbal, J. Geospatial analysis and simulation of glacial lake outburst flood hazard in Shyok Basin of Pakistan. *Environ Earth Sci* 79, 139 (2020). This clearly against good scientific practice and also against the Copernicus rules (https://publications.copernicus.org/for_authors/general_terms.html): “The work submitted for publication has not been published before, except in the form of abstracts, preprints, published lectures, theses, discussion papers, or similar formats that have not undergone full journal peer review, and it is not under consideration for peer-reviewed publication elsewhere.”

In case you disagree with this decision please contact both the editors in chief and me.

Best regards,

Tobias Bolch - Editor TC

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2019-292>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

