

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

Christopher Jarrett

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article usefully highlights the potential of interdisciplinary field research to provide a more holistic picture of a place and inform policy to address socio-environmental challenges. As other reviewers have already noted, though, the manuscript is structured in such a way that is difficult to comprehend, and it does not clearly communicate the problems such research is best equipped to address, what the specific disciplines involved each contribute, how scientific research is put into dialogue with other kinds of knowledge by such "squads," and what sorts of policy outcomes become more visible or achievable as a result of such collaborative efforts.

As others have already pointed out, the author uses a variety of terms without adequately defining or explaining them, or justifying why they are the most appropriate:

- "tradecraft": Unclear what this means
- "glocal": I know what this means as a basic concept, but it would be helpful to more clearly explain what a "glocal" methodological approach means. "Telecoupling" might be a useful concept to consider here (see, for example, Carmenta et al. 2023 Connected Conservation: Rethinking conservation for a telecoupled world in BioCon).
- "woke" ("Scientists all over the world are more than ever becoming *woke* to the climate crisis"): I agree with other reviewers that it is not advised to use such a politically charged term if another suitable alternative might suffice.
- "facts/data/features/evidences": Why are these equated? What analytical work does this combination concept do, given that each of these terms has a particular connotation and meaning in different disciplinary contexts?

The argument of the article would also be strengthened by more clearly explaining how local people have been involved in rapid survey glocal interdisciplinary squads (RSGIS), if at all. Involving local people in interepistemological dialogues during data collection and analysis, as well as the generation of policy recommendations, is essential to developing appropriate, just, and equitable solutions to socioenvironmental challenges.

Finally, it is not clear what the policy implications of this work are. How can a RSGIS approach build a stronger case for halting deforestation and forest degradation, in the specific sites studied and in general? The author repeats the same phrase several times-- "since we are looking at solutions to deforestation and its corresponding destructive outcome of biodiversity loss"-- but does not outline what recommendations the rapid survey glocal interdisciplinary squad made based on their integrated results, or how they imagine the results informing policy or action towards more sustainable futures.

