

Interactive comment on “Elevating the biogeosciences within environmental research networks” by Daniel D. Richter et al.

H.F. Jungkunst

jungkunst@uni-landau.de

Received and published: 19 March 2018

For the upcoming EGU General Assembly I have to prepare myself on Science Integrity being kindly asked by young scientist to speak on that topic. As this topic is very challenging for me, I am carefully scanning literature on topics on “reuniting” Bioscience and Geoscience. Additionally, I am highly interested if such an open discussion process before “real” publication adds to improve Science Integrity. I think it has some potential, but only if outsiders add to the discussion and that is what I do now.

I was delighted having found this beginning discussion which has the potential to serve Science Integrity. I also applaud Hank Loescher to identify himself, particularly, as it is a quite fundamental critique he puts forward. I do agree that the authors could be

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



more precise or more pushy in presenting a path forward (discussing less the present state) – it should be sharpened on what could be new. I definitely would like to have more advice on how to move forward bringing bio and geo back together. However, Hank Loescher himself keeps imprecise in his very general critique – e.g. “There are a lot of misnomers and imprecise statements that also show this bias” - which bias is not clearly stated to my opinion, at least, as an author, I would not know how to improve my work now. So I would like to encourage Hank Loescher to name the proposed biases in greater detail for the sake of Science Integrity. As an outsider, it appears to me more like criticizing with low evidence. I am sure this is not what he intended to do. For me it is more serious than other cases since Hank Loescher is a representative of Eons – one of the three program discussed in the paper – which obviously was not well described to him. To ensure his objectivity, I think Hank Loescher would be well-advised to be more precise on what he called “obvious” biases. There are not obvious to me, but may the authors know better.

Please do not get me wrong Hank Yours Hermann

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-67>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

