Open Science Workflows Training Utilizing NASA Airborne Data Sets

David Delene, Marwa Majdi and Shannon Grave

Reference

Proposal Document -Delene_OpenScience_Proposal_20221208.odt
Review Document – 0019DAPRFinalEval.pdf

Overall Rating

Good

Review Debrief

As expected for a rejection, the most important issues seems to be a "the limited to audiences specifically focused on airborne science" (Reviewer 1). It is difficult to see how to address this perception as this could be the perception of any field. In the proposal, we would apply airborne observations to modules outside of Atmospheric Graduate student, which was hoped to be sufficient. Additionally, listed the field project and instruments to illustrate the scope; however, needed more details at end of page 6. More of a summary could have been include at end of page 6. Maybe the proposal should of address the audience size more using historical data from the ADPAA package. Did list the number of developers of ADPAA. Cloud maybe have listed the number of papers that referenced the ADPAA paper, maybe including the total number of co-authors. Could include summary table to show size of audience. However, without a reference to compare, I am not sure the reviewers would know how to judge the audience size. Can't really think of a good comparison but may be enough to provide data and ask reviewers to compare to software packages they know.

I am surprised on the confusion of the reviewers not understanding that an employed undergraduate student could provide feed-back on an educational module developed for a graduate class. The reviewer seemed to think that only graduate student could comment on educational module developed for graduate students. This is like having a atmospheric science student not be able to comment and provide feed back on a module developed for aviation students. Hence, the proposal should have been structured differently or more clearly presented the role of the undergraduate student in the project.

Surprised that reviewer three would think that 15 months of a PostDoc's time, along with the other personnel may not be sufficient for creating the modules. Not sure how demonstrate the level of material already developed versus what needs to be done. Again maybe a table that provide some estimate of the time used for the developed material versus time in the proposal.

In summary, I believe the confusion with undergraduate researcher tasks and material developed / to be developed could be adjusted. The main issue is addressing audiences limited view may be difficult. Could provide historical information on audience size but not sure how to show comparison or what the project's audience would be.