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

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 10 December 2019

General comment. This paper describes a very interesting experience in which Early Career Scientists (ECS), as a group, reviewed one of the Special Reports of the IPCC AR6. Moreover, it also briefly points to some issues for ECS' reviewers, and suggests potential solutions. The paper clearly describes all the procedure and presents some statistics about the participation and the outcome.

Specific comment. Although the Methods, and the Results and discussion sections are strongly focusing on the review of an IPCC report, the authors tried to apply what they learned from this experience to the review of a scientific paper. On my point of view this is a completely different exercise. I agree that the experience gained in the group review of an IPCC can be very useful when reviewing a scientific paper. However, the experiment presented in this paper can in no way be a basis to 'offer recommendations

to editors of journal'. I don't mean that the authors opinion on that point is wrong or useless. I just say that there is no relation between the topic of the paper and this specific piece of conclusion. On the other hand, the paper is published in a journal with open review, as several other EGU journals. I was wondering how much ECS are taking this opportunity to submit (unsolicited) reviews.

I also have a few specific comments to the authors:

P2 l53: 'attracted comments . . . countries.' A reference would be welcome here

P2 l64-67: 'APECS . . . Engineering.' This could more interestingly be moved to the recruitment section.

P2 l77-79: This should be deleted as the same information is repeated later (p4 l155)

P2 l 79-86: It would be interesting to know how many chapters each council member was chairing.

P3 l94-99: Why was it decided to select only a subset of the applicants for the review? Which were the criteria for this selection? More specifically, how was the motivation measured? How was the experience assessed? Were the applicants without experience rejected (although giving experience was an objective as well)? What was the criteria on the country? Did you discriminate participants according to their country of residence?

P5: section 2.4 could probably better fit in the Results section than in the Method one. Figure 1a and table 1 are providing exactly the same information. Delete one of them. Figure 1b: what is the y-axis?

P7 l208-209: 'rather than an entire chapter'. Please explain. I don't think that expert reviewers had to review one full chapter. Rather they were probably reviewing the sections connected to their expertise, possibly in several chapters.

P7 l211: How do you measure the 'quality and relevance' of the ECS comments?

P7 l254: How do you measure that the attribution process does not influence the quality of the comments?

P8 l 271-276: You listed several benefits for ECS, although number one is more a benefit for the report (and as written there, it lets the reader assume that the more senior scientists are not very rigorous). You also mention 'recognition' but I couldn't identify information about 'recognition' in the paper. What do you mean and how is it measured?

P9 l285-300: You wrote interesting suggestions to involve more ECS in the review process although as mentioned above, I don't think that it is a conclusion of your experience but a 'personal' opinion. Moreover, all these suggestions would require a study to measure how much they are already taken into account.

C3