

Interactive comment on “Proposed Best Practices for Collaboration at Cross-disciplinary Observatories” by Jason Philip Kaye et al.

Jason Philip Kaye et al.

jpk12@psu.edu

Received and published: 14 October 2019

Reviewer comment 1: The premise of this submission is sound: that large interdisciplinary science teams face a number of challenges that smaller, single domain teams often do not. Development of guidelines of best practices generally do not exist for interdisciplinary teams. This paper is the manual used by a large interdisciplinary long-term field-based research effort. It could provide useful information for other similar teams to develop their own guidelines from. There are also aspects that could apply to very different, non-field, types of projects. For example 2.1.3. use of someone's code or model output. . . .”, 2.1.8 how long should co-authors have to review manuscript”, etc.

C1

Author reply 1: Thank you, we hoped this would be the case.

Reviewer comment 2: The current Perspective paper would need to be considerably shortened (perspectives C1 BGD Interactive comment Printer-friendly version Discussion paper guidelines state such papers should be very short (a few pages)). This could be done by removing/summarizing some of the detail that is specific to this project – condense to key points.

Author reply 2: We had contacted the editors about the length of our manuscript prior to submission. The editors had agreed that despite the unorthodox length, the manuscript would be considered. If the editors feel the paper should be shortened to a few pages we would need to consider if that is possible. Thus, we did not endeavor to shorten the overall length of the manuscript. However, we did change the paper length slightly in response to the next comment.

Reviewer comment 3: As one example, lines 265-295 are very specific to this particular project. Are there social scientists involved in the project, or only biogeophysical? If the former, would have been useful to specifically discuss how to resolve some of the challenges integrating these often quite different research approaches, etc..

Author reply 3: We agree that these lines became too specific to the project. There are no social scientists involved in our project, though this seems like an area for future improvement of this living document. To address the high level of specificity, we reworked this section (former lines 265-295), gearing it toward a more general audience, and in doing so cut the length of the text significantly. We also removed some details about permitting from section 1 that were redundant with section 2.2. We did not change the document to include social science perspectives because we lack the experience to do so.

Reviewer comment 4: Given that this is an existing manual, it does not seem appropriate to comment, as a reviewer, on whether I agree with the specific guidelines they have established.

C2

Author reply 4: No changes were made to the document with respect to this comment.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-249>, 2019.