

Response to Reviewers

GC Insights: Choosing the right map projection, and what it means for scale bars and north arrows — egusphere-2026-4209

I thank both reviewers for careful, substantive reports. RC1's reading is generous, and its three requests are all straightforward to meet. RC2's report is far more demanding, and several of its requests run up against the format the manuscript was submitted under: GC Insights is capped at 500–1500 words and one figure or table, and the journal's own manuscript-types page states that an Insight “does not have to be explored in detail” and that “supplementary material should be limited.” The current main text, even before this round of revision, already runs to roughly 1,720 words — over that ceiling. I have therefore fixed every genuine error RC2 identifies, but redirected requests for additional methodological detail to the Supplement (which already contains most of it) rather than expanding the main text further; below, I explain point by point where I have not made a requested change and why.

Reviewer 1 (RC1)

1. Coding method. *The main text might state how the samples were judged, whether by hand/eye or somehow hard-coded.*

Response: Agreed. Added to the main text: each map was coded by eye against a protocol fixed in advance, from the figure, its caption, and any explicit statement of the projection in the surrounding text (Supplement Sect. S3).

2. Southern latitudes omitted from Fig. 1. *Is there a reason why all the global maps omit showing the most southern latitudes? It makes them feel incomplete.*

Response: Agreed — checked the source figure and confirmed the Equal Earth and Mollweide panels are cropped and omit Antarctica and the southern tips of South America/Africa/Australia.

3. UN General Assembly resolution on Equal Earth. *Is it worth mentioning that the Equal Earth projection has just been voted for by the U.N. General Assembly as the preferred map projection?*

Response: Agreed, and it strengthens the argument usefully: a single endorsed default (Equal Earth) does not remove the need to match projection to purpose. Added one sentence in “Why projections matter” with a new reference entry (A/80/L.104; United Nations General Assembly, 2026).

4. Optional — practical checklist for graphic creators. *Provide simple, clear ‘to-dos’ for authors/creators of the graphics, maybe with a good example clarifying scale/north/Tissot.*

Response: Partially accepted, kept minimal to respect the format and the reviewer's own preference for a short, punchy text: added a 3-step checklist (name the projection with its EPSG code; show a graticule where the geometry isn't obvious; include a scale bar or north arrow only where the projection makes it valid) inside the existing “Making deliberate choices” paragraph, at essentially no net word cost. This also answers RC2's related complaint that the manuscript otherwise “leaves the reader adrift.” A full worked example with annotated scale bar/north arrow/Tissot indicatrix would be a good idea but does not fit the word budget; it could go in the Supplement if the editor is comfortable expanding it, though GC Insights supplements are meant to stay limited too.

5. Optional — root cause (lack of training in graphic design). *Worth mentioning the underlying cause: most academics are never trained in graphic design or data visualisation (cf. Crameri and Hason, 2024).*

Response: Considered but not added to the main text to stay within the word budget, the manuscript already draws the colour-scale parallel via Crameri et al. (2020) and Stoelzle and Stein (2021), so the point is present, if not developed as far as RC1 suggests. Happy to add the Crameri and Hason (2024) citation and a clause if the editor allows a modest overage; noting it here so the decision isn't lost.