

Interactive comment on “The benefits to climate science of including Early Career Scientists as reviewers” by Mathieu Casado et al.

Gary McDowell (Referee)

garymcdow@gmail.com

Received and published: 11 November 2019

Overall this is a very interesting study and an excellent piece of work. In particular, I noted that Figure 1 is excellent.

I have some specific comments/questions below, but my major comment is about "comments" - I'm unfamiliar with the process that reviewers were participating in, and would greatly appreciate clarification (even a schematic, if that were thought helpful):

Could you elaborate on the size and structure of "comments"? Why do people submit multiple comments? How long is a comment? What does it relate to e.g. is there a new comment for each issue raised? Is this roughly equivalent to commenting in a word processing document? It's not clear what the reviewers are actually submitting, and in

C1

what format. It sounds like all reviews/comment are compiled into one long review to be submitted to the IPCC on behalf of APECS - is this the case? (Line 204) Could you also explain what you mean by a "group review" - this terminology may not be standard and it would be helpful to clarify the concept, especially if this is a phenomenon unique to the IPCC.

Other questions:

Line 68 - "Recognising that many of the reviewers had neither published a paper nor participated in a peer-review before" - is there evidence for this claim? Were they surveyed or are you merely surmising? Especially as this seems to be contradicted in line 86 - "Among the applicants, 72% had already reviewed a scientific document (such as a paper, a proposal or a scientific report)."

In Table 1, 5 of the 6 countries with largest representation are primarily English-speaking. Is this distribution as expected for the population of researchers? Is it solely a reflection of the over-representation of English-speaking countries in the network advertising the call for reviewers as indicated in the text following in the table? Is it a reflection of a document being written in English? These are very minor questions, mostly my interest was piqued.

Line 139 - Could you clarify - was a student paired with a postdoc/early academic in each case? What was the format for exchanges to occur - were they connected in space and time or was all pairing remote/over email/internet exchanges?

Line 210 - Was there any data gathered on the length of training of reviewers? It is possible, for example, that a PhD student in the US could have as much time in training as a senior postdoc in the UK.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2019-20, 2019.

C2