

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2022-387-RC2>, 2023  
© Author(s) 2023. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## **Comment on essd-2022-387**

Mengze Li (Referee)

---

Referee comment on "Journals with open-discussion forums are excellent educational resources for peer review training exercises" by Nadine Borduas-Dedekind et al., Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2022-387-RC2>, 2023

---

This editorial discusses a peer-reviewing training exercise for students and young scientists using ESSD platform. As many young scientists didn't get any peer-review training before they start reviewing scientific manuscripts, it is a great idea to take advantage of open access and interactive platforms such as ESSD to train them under the mentorship from experienced scientists. Such practice can be very valuable not only to young scientists but also the science community. I only have minor comments and suggestions for the authors to consider.

As pointed out by the other reviewer, the authors should widen the scope and potential impact of this practice. Particularly consider rephrasing 'student training exercise' as 'early-career scientist training exercise'. Also, although this exercise used an ESSD manuscript, it can be applied to other interactive journals for future exercise, the authors should emphasize this point.

This practice requires mentorship from experienced scientists who are normally very busy. Any suggestions on how to encourage senior scientists to do so? How should ESSD (or other similar journals) and institutions support such training exercise? Any improvements that the authors will do for future training exercise?

Line 43: 'one of us' to 'one of the authors'

Line 44: I was confused when I read ' the goal of this workshop' when no other description of the workshop is given. Perhaps rewrite the sentence into something like 'The authors organized a peer-review workshop for early-career scientists, the goal was xxx '

Lines 47-49: how many undergraduate and graduate (Master and PhD) students? How were they assigned to work on different sections of the manuscript (random, or students' interest)?

Lines 60-61: are there any recognitions for the students, e.g. their names mentioned in the review reports?