Biogeosciences Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-249-RC2, 2019 © Author(s) 2019. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



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

Justus van Beusekom (Referee)

justus.van.beusekom@hzg.de

Received and published: 30 August 2019

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.

A paper like this is somewhat unusual, especially, as the paper is based on a docu-

C₁

ment that is meant to change (improve) based on internal discussions. However, given the theme, it certainly will be of general interest and of general importance for other interdisciplinary projects and for the scientists involved.

Therefore, I do support that the present ms will ultimately be published. However, I have suggestion that may be considered by the authors.

- 1) 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?
- 2) 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?
- 3) Maybe I overlooked it, but I would welcome link to the living document.

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