

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-20-RC2>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## **Comment on gc-2021-20**

Rachel Bosch (Referee)

---

Referee comment on "Clear, transparent, and timely communication for fair authorship decisions: a practical guide" by Shahzad Gani et al., Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-20-RC2>, 2021

---

I apologize for the lateness of this review. I was not very busy when I accepted the invitation to review, but in the intervening time, several commitments came up, preventing me from submitting this review on time.

### **General comments**

This paper has the potential to make a significant contribution to changing the way that authorship decisions are handled across disciplines throughout not just science but all of academia. This process is suggested at the right time in our culture, when the conversation about increasing equity and inclusion is prominent in many institutions.

I like the way this paper is structured, using its own publishing process as a transparent test case to present how the co-authorship form would work. I can envision myself adopting this for future authorship discussions for my own publications. Thank you for doing this work and submitting it for publication!

### **Specific comments**

I do not have any specific comments or concerns about the methodology or structure of this paper. I have a few technical corrections and suggestions, listed below.

### **Technical corrections**

Throughout the document: It was unclear to me the reason for italicizing your key words. This seemed unnecessary.

Line 81-82: I recommend splitting this into two sentences to improve clarity: "This EWWG aims to ensure the well-being and fairness of the INAR community. It consists of staff members. . . ."

Line 90 et al.: Include date of last access for all Internet citations.

Line 94: This is your first in-text reference to supplementary material. 1) It was unclear to me why your supplementary materials were labeled as "SI." 2) Consider re-ordering your supplements so that they are referred to in the text in the same order as they appears in the supplement.

Line 99: Consider changing "once mixed" to "rearranged once."

Lines 194-195: I had to read the sentence beginning, "This avoids that authorship. . . .," several times. It is awkward and would benefit from rewording.

Line 212: Change "focus" to "focused" for grammatical consistency with the other listed adjectives.

Line 231: Change "play" to "played" so that it will be in past tense.

Line 242: Delete the word "a" between "in" and "multiple".

Line 257: Change "impact on those lower" to "impact those who are lower".

Line 263: Delete "on".

Line 263: Delete "However," and capitalize "Ultimately".

Line 305: Change "till" to "until".

Figure 1: I like this flowchart, but the way it is structured, I thought at first that the AWG was a subset or subordinate to the EWWG. Consider restructuring this flowchart so that the AWG sits in a third column.

SI 1: In the Overview table, consider deleting "coin toss, a chess, tournament, etc." I feel like including these trivializes or makes light of the process. It is also inconsistent with every other mention of randomization method where only last-name alphabetical is mentioned.

SI 1: You defined the acronym for CRediT taxonomy in section 3.2 of the main paper. However, SI 1 is referred to in section 2 of the paper, leading readers to perhaps encounter that term for the first time in SI 1. Please define that acronym upon first usage in the supplementary material as well as in the paper.

SI 3: It might have been interesting to read the results of this survey in addition to seeing the survey form.