

# Review of: "Forming The Rapid Survey Interdisciplinary Team with Multiscalar Tradecraft: a Plea in the Backdrop of the Anthropocene"

Antonio Jesús Ortiz-Villarejo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de Jaén

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Although the paper is a note/appeal, it is extremely general and at times unclear. I understand the idea that the author wants to convey, but it is necessary to review the text to provide clear support for it. As the author states in the final lines of the introduction, the main aim of this paper is not new. Nowadays, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches are essential in science. Therefore, I believe that this paper needs to be reformulated and clearly structured.

In terms of structure, the introduction section needs to be reformulated to include the main idea of the paper. While I believe the idea is correct, the introduction should include statements that are better suited for the conclusion section, such as the number of team members and the last four lines. The introduction should also include a mention of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).

Although the paper's idea is presented as a note/appeal, the structure is very similar to that of a research paper, which is confusing. This necessitates a more detailed reformulation of the paper.

Here are some further remarks regarding each specific section:

Fig. 1: If the SRTM is downloaded from NASA, a link to the website should be included in the footnote.

**Anthropocene:** This section needs to be reformulated, considering that it will be read by non-specialists. There are certain data, such as RCP2.6, that need to be explained. The author assumes that the acronyms are known to the reader, but at least the first time they are mentioned, they should be written out and specified.

**Ecosystem of Facts/Data/Features/Evidences:** The title of this section does not clearly reflect its content. It is expected to provide a description of the study area. Additionally, it would be more valuable to include and justify the disciplines mentioned in the interdisciplinarity section.

The quality of Figure 2 needs to be improved.

**Interdisciplinary:** The definition of interdisciplinarity should also be included in the introduction. In this section, it is important to specify the different disciplines that the author is writing about and explain why they are relevant.

**Proposed Methods – Multiscalar Tradecraft:** This section is insufficient. It only briefly mentions two visualization

techniques, Satellite and RPAS, without providing any references. From the text, the reader would expect more than just these two techniques, especially since the author mentions that the squad size should be between 4 to 8 core team members.

**The Baroro Case:** I think that the author uses "glocal" in a very general way. While I understand its use in previous pages, it is not clear in this part, where the author is supposed to describe the study area.

What does "specimen" refer to? The description of the study area is confusing and mixes very different aspects that, although interrelated, need to be clearly explained. Also, I believe this section should be included after the introduction to provide the reader with a clear context.

**Brahmini kite:** This section consists of only 4 lines and has not been referred to throughout the text. Without anymore explanation has no sense, why Brahmini kite and no other species, why don't talk about vegetation...?

**Discussion:** The GIS approach is not mentioned in the text, and it should be. Furthermore, the intended research for which interdisciplinary collaboration is proposed needs to be clearly stated, along with the proposed interdisciplinary team and the reasons behind the selection of specific disciplines.

The quote from Ramirez et al. (2019:10) should be highlighted in bold.