

## ***Interactive comment on “Geo-locate Project: A novel approach to resolving meteorological station location issues with the assistance of undergraduate students” by Simon Noone et al.***

**Simon Noone et al.**

simon.noone@mu.ie

Received and published: 18 September 2019

Anonymous Referee #2 Received and published: 7 September 2019 This is an Interesting and worthwhile project, which has clearly enriched both students' experience and data sets. The authors would like to thank referee 2 for their comments and suggestions.

My suggestions are mostly regards the quality of the writing and presentational issues. Figures and tables would be better if integrated with the text and placed soon after they are referred to. The reader having to flick back and forth interrupts the flow. Response: This will be done by the journal in the final version of the paper so that both figures and

C1

tables are integrated at the appropriate locations.

Section 5.2 - this section contains a detailed description of results. However, there is rather a lot for the reader to take in. Could Table 1 be moved to the main body of the article (or could some of these be displayed in graphical form, e.g. pie charts to make this information easier to 'see')? Response: The table will be placed appropriately in the final layout.

Then some brief discussion might then be given to analysis/possible reasons for students' responses. For example, any thoughts why fewer than 50% of students were more motivated than usual, considering the value of this work? Response: We have added the following text to line 453-459; "Of course, the wording of some of the survey questions may have influenced the student responses in a certain way and the wording will be reviewed in subsequent surveys. For example, fewer than 50% of students felt that they were more motivated than usual doing this assignment. This response is somewhat contrary to previous research (Ryan et al., 2018) and it is slightly contradictory from the other survey responses which are generally positive. However, you can also interpret this result as not being too negative as it suggests that students were no less motivated than usual doing the assignment. The wording of this question may have confused students and we will consider changing the wording in future to remove any ambiguity."

It would be interesting to hear any initial thoughts on how some of the issues highlighted by students could be addressed, perhaps in the conclusions section. Response: Reviewer 1 made some similar observations and we have addressed both reviewers comments in the revised section 6 where we discuss potential future innovations. Specific suggestions

Line 49 - already stated what CS3 means so can just use the acronym alone. Response: Line 49 – We have edited the sentence as suggested.

Line 49 - what does ECMWF stand for? This is outlined later in lines 52 and line

C2

53. Should be outlined in the first instance. Similar instances on lines 69 and 70.  
Response: We have edited the text accordingly.

Line 67 - full stop missing after 'et al,'. Response: Added the full stop.

Line 76 - should be C3S, not CDS. Same with line 79. Response: CDS is an acronym for the Climate Data Store as mentioned on line 58/59

Line 179 - what does NCDC stand for? Response: NCEI was the old name for this source. We have changed the text to reflect the new name of this data source "NOAA/NCEI's" NOAA/NCEI is explained in line 47-48

Line 183 - '...has the most stations location issues...' Should be 'station'. Same error on line 184. Response: edited the text as suggested.

Line 222 - apostrophe missing - should be stations', or remove the 's'? Response: Removed the "s" from the sentence.

Line 244 - should be '...students were required...'. Same issue at start of line 246.  
Response: Edited the text as suggested

Line 257 - apostrophe missing - should be ...'students' work...'. Response: added apostrophe were suggested.

Line 293 - earth should have a capital'E;. Response: changed to capital E

Line 445 - '...to an important global project...' - should be followed by a comma, not a full stop. Response: Changed to a comma.

Line 466 - should be students' rather than student's responses - misplaced apostrophe.  
Response: Removed the 's in student's

Line 477 - support rather than supports. Response: Changed to support.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2019-10>, 2019.