

# Review of: "Lake Bonneville and the Wasatch Fault – new theories and new paradigms yield insights into present-day hazards in other regions of the world"

Alexandre Cardoso<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Campinas (Unicamp)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First, I would like to thank the author and Qeios for the opportunity of review this manuscript. English is not my native language, so it is possible that some minor mistakes occur in my comments. I am available to clarify any comment if the author needs, and you can contact me in any case. However, I regret to say that I cannot recommend the publication of this manuscript in the current version. I highlight the main problems that support my decision below.

The manuscript needs further organization of its structure and data presentation. I recommend specifically caution with title and abstract. The text is very confusing and requires organization following good practices in scientific writing. Several problems are raised from the literature, but all of them are not properly approached. The author do not give to the reader a chance to critically evaluate previous data and interpretations, and present all of them as “conflicting”, “confusing”, “controversial”. I strongly recommend a soft language and a more careful approach.

The introduction section is too long and the objectives of the manuscript, as well as the methods applied, are not properly indicated. The biggest part of the introduction would fit in a topic of Geological Setting. What exactly is the research question in the manuscript? It is not obvious for the reader. Is this a critical evaluation of the literature? A review? Please, clarify.

Please, consider the elaboration of tables with previous literature data and problems, figures with data compilation of different approaches, and organization of the literature review in topics such as: a) shoreline data and geomorphology of bars, b) paleontological data, c) geochemical data.

In the current presentation, this paper fits informative journals, sharing of ideas, but not a scientific journal. I would really like to see a version of the text with a clearer organization and subdivisions, such as a) introduction, b) geological setting and literature review, c) results or data presentation, and d) discussion. All these sections are mixed along the paper, and personal belief are mixed with evidence-based discussions.

Please, provide a new and more organized version of your ideas to undergo the scrutiny of scientific community. There are many good ideas here, but not a reliable data presentation and literature appraisal.

Best regards,



Alexandre Cardoso