

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: Interdisciplinary science is necessary to further our understanding of the earth system, but managing the scientific work of such projects is challenging especially in the light of the manifold interdependences. In the present ms the authors describe the present state of an ongoing document describing the best practice in a large interdisciplinary project (SSH CZO). In the present article, the 10 points are described including Authorship, Installing, Using and Removing Infrastructure, sharing data, project management, student advise, outreach and reporting. I read the paper with great interest and recognised several of the issues.

Author response 1: Thank you, we are glad the paper offered some generalizable

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



insights.

Reviewer comment 2: The author list includes the SSHCZO team. This has been done before, but I would welcome an addition to the section 2.1 that discusses the inclusion of teams as authors: e.g. how to document their contribution to a paper (as is expected in many papers). In what respect is the inclusion different from an acknowledgement?

Author response 2: Thank you for this suggestion. We agree that a discussion of how to define a team is appropriate to add to the manuscript. In response to this comment, we added section 2.1.15

Reviewer comment 3: Whereas Section 2.1 is generic, several of the further points (especially 2.2 -2.7) are quite specific to the SSHCZO. Is it possible to include /extract some kind of generic conclusions that may enhance the applicability of the present document to a wider public?

Author response 3: We agree that these sections included specificity that may not have been needed. In response to this review, we edited sections 2.2 -2.7 to speak more generally about permitting and best practices 2.2, 2.3, and 2.6. However, 2.2 received the most heavy handed editing. Our idea was that organizational structure like “steering committee” and “program manager” were in fact generic and relevant to all CZOs (lines 96-105). Thus, when we discuss our “steering committee” our hope is that readers see this not as a unique case, but rather as a general model for CZO organization structure. We changed the title of “Watershed Specialist” to “Field Operations Specialist” in recognition of the fact that all CZOs would have field operations, but they might not focus on watersheds.

Reviewer comment 4: Maybe I overlooked it, but I would welcome link to the living document.

Author response 4: Excellent point. We added the the link to the living document in section 3.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

