

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Calving out a space to exist: “Marked” identities in polar science’s “unmarked spaces”

Original Research, Earth Sci. Syst. Soc.

Reviewer: Michael Prior-Jones

Submitted on: 27 Jan 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/esss.2023.10070

### EVALUATION

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

This study relates to the experiences of employees at BAS who are members of minoritised groups, and their experience of working in the organisation. The key finding is that whilst the organisation aims to be more inclusive, and runs many EDI initiatives, many staff members find that minoritised groups still experience rejection, discrimination and exclusion, though mostly in a covert manner.

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

The key limitation, acknowledged by the authors, is that only self-identified minoritised individuals were interviewed, and no interviews were made with "core-group" members (i.e. white, male, straight, able-bodied, middle-class etc...)

#### **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 not qualified to comment on this aspect of the manuscript, as I am not a social scientist. I have answered "Yes" to the questions in Q4 to be allowed to submit my review, but I ask the editors to find another reviewer to look at these technical aspects in detail as this is not my area of expertise. Likewise, with the Quality Assessment, I feel I am not well-placed to make these judgements.

#### **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)

Not Applicable.

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?  
Not Applicable.

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

My background: I am not a social scientist so will not comment on the methodology or theoretical background of the study. However, I am a former member of BAS staff and a member of the LGBTQ community.

Introduction (lines 41-55) - during this discussion of the colonial history of BAS, is it perhaps worth pointing out that the administration of British government operations in Antarctica is still conducted using the colonial template: the British Antarctic Territory is governed by a commissioner based in London, has its own laws and taxes that are decided by fiat by that commissioner, and its own courts that enforce those laws, for whom the judges, magistrates and coroner are appointed by the commissioner.  
<https://britishantarcticterritory.org.uk/about/legislation/>

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Q 6</b> Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 7</b> Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 9</b> Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>