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: Anouk Beniest Submitted on: 27 Feb 2023 Article DOI: 10.3389/esss.2023.10070

EVALUATION

Q1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This manuscript provides insights into the social mechanisms in place that affect minority employees at BAS' from anonymized interviews with 14 employees. The manuscript reflects on our sociological understanding of self-identification and group-building processes and develops a new framework 'marked spaces' vs 'unmarked' spaces in which these social constructs can be analyzed. The study rightly points out that while minority BAS employees experience and perceive rejection/discrimination/sexism/exclusion, these experiences are a direct response to the identification processes and accompanying actions of the dominant group.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

I guess more testimonials would reveal more detail on the social constructs exerted by the dominant group that lead the negative experiences of minority employees. Nevertheless, 14 interviews is a decent database and the authors put the testimonials very well in social concepts and constructs.

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.

The methods are clearly written, including a table with some statistical information on the demography of the interviewed group of people. What would be interesting to share, would be a list of questions that were asked to the interviewees, if possible maybe as an appendix. If people would like to conduct a similar survey in their own institute, having a template would come in handy.

The results in the form of short transcripts allows the authors to be to the point and on topic. I have a few comments on the structure, which I have pointed out below.

Q 4 Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality? Yes.

Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory? Not Applicable.

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) Not Applicable.

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):

No answer given.

