

Reviewer 2:

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.

Agreed. We changed the term student to early career scientist when speaking of the broader context and of the benefits of the exercise. We did keep the word student when referring to our workshop description and to the student perspective, as the term more precisely describes the targeted audience during the exercises we are describing.

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?

This comment is a fair point. We don't have obvious solutions but brainstorm below:

1. In the context of a course, the instructor and the student obtain credit for teaching and taking the course, respectively.
2. There is an intrinsic benefit when experienced scientists are investing in the future of the peer-review process. If all reviewers must go through a training program first, then we raise the bar of the quality of reviewing.
3. Journals could incentivise these types of training by requiring that new reviewers participate in a short online course before accepting to review for the first time. This training can be a short video followed by a quiz. However, reviewers are already hard to come by, and we can imagine that editors might oppose this process as it might slow the onboarding of new reviewers. Either way, there could be future discussions on this point in order to raise the effectiveness of the peer-review process.

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

We've tried to rehaul the use of "I" and "we" throughout the article to avoid authors' voice confusion. We think that now with the restructuring of the sections, we can provide a clearer flow and tone. We therefore use "we" throughout the text, and as the reviewer suggested, use "I" within specific sections with our names associated.

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 '

Fair point. In our restructuring of the article, we now describe the workshop as well as the course in more detail in a separate section. We've also revised the manuscript to focus on recommendations of a workshop instead of what had been previously done.

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)?

In the instructor experience described in the manuscript, there were 2 PhD, 3 MSc and 2 BSc students in the (now explicitly stated in the manuscript). The assignment in this case was on a volunteer basis.

In the student experience described in the manuscript, the instructor identified specific aspects or sections of the manuscript for all of the students to review each week. Additionally, students considered applications for the data based on their individual interests. This group consisted of about 10 students, a majority of which were graduate students. This information has been added to the manuscript.

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

In the case of NBD's experience, yes, the names of all student participants were mentioned in the reviewer report which is publicly posted on the discussion tab of the article (now mentioned explicitly). In the case of the course, only one student name was posted in the comment.