Dear Mathew Stiller-Reeve,

Thank you for the constructive feedback to the manuscript. Many of the comments were previously addressed and implemented in response to the reviewer comments, and we refer to our previous responses in the open discussion for their implementation, e.g., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2024-6-AC1 and https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2024-6-AC2. In addition, please find below our inline responses to the constructive comments raised in the editor decision.

Please also note that the (latexdiff) manuscript marked with differences is compared to the original submission, not to the snippets provided to the reviewers in the respective replies in the discussion.

With best regards and on behalf of the authors,

Peter Betlem

(Editor decision comments in white, author response in red)

The reviewers have already highlighted some issues I also noticed in the paper. Here is a list of these issues:

1. Introduction and Framing: The introduction is too long and focuses too much on the broader debate regarding Open Educational Resources (OERs). Since the paper's focus is the use of Jupyter books, please ensure this is clearly the main topic. Additionally, I would appreciate more background information on Jupyter books themselves, as I am not familiar with them.

- We have restructured the main text to clarify and better emphasise the use of Jupyter Books. We have also provided additional background information on Jupyter Books themselves in the introduction.

2. Research Question: As noted by reviewers, the research question was unclear to me as well. I highly recommend clearly stating a research question (with a question mark) in the introduction, using it as an anchor throughout the paper. The readership will benefit if you provide a concrete answer to this question at the beginning of the Discussion section before elaborating on the results.

- We have restructured the introduction and expanded the last introduction paragraph to state the goals of the paper, then discussed them in the discussion. We have also shortened the introduction.

3. Figures and Tables: I found Figure 1 challenging to understand due to the arrows pointing in various directions and the boxes labeled "course n," which do not relate to this particular research story. The figure does not aid my understanding of the text. Please either remove it or revise it (and the text) so that it adds value for the reader. Table 1 requires tidying to prevent overlapping text. Table 2 seems tangential, as it introduces “Open enough Rubric” for the first time. Table 2 presents results from an analysis, which should be described in the Methods, presented in the Results, and discussed in the Discussion. It should also clarify how this new information helps answer the research question you pose.

- Table 1 was previously updated while addressing R2 and the suggested changes implemented in this latest version.
- We have revised Figure 1 and improved its caption as well as provided additional details in the main text.
- Table 2 was updated/moved as part of the response to R1. Additional brief sections were added to the methods and results sections to explain and detail the method and findings.

4. Ethical Considerations: You mention that anonymity was maintained, which is good. However, please reference the ethical guidelines you followed or any approvals you received. It is important to ensure the survey was conducted ethically and that data storage and management were appropriate. This needs to be explained in the paper. Please refer to this article (https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/4/493/2021/) for advice, or feel free to ask me for further clarification.

- A link to the ethical guidelines was added to the methods section and the relevant paragraph was expanded with additional information about the study design.

5. Interdisciplinary Group: You mention that natural scientists, social scientists, and students need to be involved in the developments you describe. Could you please provide details on how your team was composed of natural and social scientists and how this collaboration worked?

- We provide a brief overview of how the team was composed and how this collaboration worked below. Some additions were made to the main text, but please let us know to what extent this should be further addressed.
    - Natural scientists (PB and NR) implemented the first versions of the modules.
    - In dialogue with social scientist (MVK), the modules were updated, and the questionnaire was developed to obtain quantitative and qualitative student feedback. Discussions and pedagogical insights provided by MVK further improved accessibility for students.
    - Co-creation was pursued through a shared interest of the natural scientists, familiar with code versioning and co-creation in programming projects, and MVK, who highlighted the benefits of the approach in teaching. Students were encouraged by the instructors to actively contribute to the resources through the back end.
    - Logistics support (SMC) provided practical feedback from a logistics point of view, and technical feedback related to operational design, suggesting the Geo-MOD course (Course 2) to bring attention to the usability of co-creation and shared resources across departments.

Above all, please ensure that the real focus is on the Jupyter book you developed and the implementation and assessment efforts that made it beneficial for your students. I look forward to seeing the updated version. Please implement the changes you have suggested to the reviewers and respond to my comments by making changes directly to the text.

- All changes suggested to the reviewers have been implemented. These have been further revised with regard to the constructive comments and suggestions raised above.