

Contours of citizen science: a vignette study

Muki Haklay, Dilek Fraisl, Bastian Greshake Tzovaras, Susanne Hecker, Margaret Gold, Gerid Hager, Luigi Ceccaroni, Barbara Kieslinger, Uta Wehn, Sasha Woods, Christian Nold, Bálint Balázs, Marzia Mazzonetto, Simone Rufenacht, Lea A. Shanley, Katherin Wagenknecht, Alice Motion, Andrea Sforzi, Dorte Riemenschneider, Daniel Dorler, Florian Heigl, Teresa Schaefer, Ariel Lindner, Maike Weisspflug, Monika Mačiulienė and Katrin Vohland

Article citation details

R. Soc. open sci. **8**: 202108.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsos.202108>

Review timeline

Original submission: 19 November 2020
Revised submission: 23 July 2021
Final acceptance: 26 July 2021

Note: Reports are unedited and appear as submitted by the referee. The review history appears in chronological order.

Review History

RSOS-202108.R0 (Original submission)

Review form: Reviewer 1

Is the manuscript scientifically sound in its present form?

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Do you have any ethical concerns with this paper?

No

Have you any concerns about statistical analyses in this paper?

No

Recommendation?

Accept with minor revision (please list in comments)

Comments to the Author(s)

It was an absolute pleasure to read this manuscript "Contours of citizen science". One of the most well-executed papers I've read in some time, and will definitely help the field of citizen science and also contribute to our understanding of what that "field" looks like! I think the figures, interpretation, and conclusions were all excellent. I also like how they treated the term 'citizen science' in the introduction. A great perspective.

Only because I feel like I should have at least one "comment"...

When I was reading through the introduction, it didn't jump out at me who the audience was of the survey. It looks like it was somewhat general, but in the end it was mostly people like myself I assume who work in the field of citizen science - either running projects, analyzing data, academics etc. And this is a source of bias in the survey participants results. This is totally fine, but I think just potentially worth highlighting how this was set up and why these were the targets. On a side note, would be interesting to repeat this, but target the contributors to the citizen science projects a bit more heavily!

Regardless, great stuff, and I look forward to citing it in my future work.

Review form: Reviewer 2**Is the manuscript scientifically sound in its present form?**

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Do you have any ethical concerns with this paper?

No

Have you any concerns about statistical analyses in this paper?

No

Recommendation?

Accept with minor revision (please list in comments)

Comments to the Author(s)

1. The justification for the use of vignette is not convincing enough because the paper failed to present other available options.
2. The use of past experience without mention of personal characteristics as basis of judgment need to be explained.

Decision letter (RSOS-202108.R0)

We hope you are keeping well at this difficult and unusual time. We continue to value your support of the journal in these challenging circumstances. If Royal Society Open Science can assist you at all, please don't hesitate to let us know at the email address below.

Dear Dr Haklay

On behalf of the Editors, we are pleased to inform you that your Manuscript RSOS-202108 "Contours of citizen science: a vignette study" has been accepted for publication in Royal Society Open Science subject to minor revision in accordance with the referees' reports. Please find the referees' comments along with any feedback from the Editors below my signature. Please accept our apologies the lengthy review process.

We invite you to respond to the comments and revise your manuscript. Below the referees' and Editors' comments (where applicable) we provide additional requirements. Final acceptance of your manuscript is dependent on these requirements being met. We provide guidance below to help you prepare your revision.

Please submit your revised manuscript and required files (see below) no later than 7 days from today's (ie 14-Jul-2021) date. Note: the ScholarOne system will 'lock' if submission of the revision is attempted 7 or more days after the deadline. If you do not think you will be able to meet this deadline please contact the editorial office immediately.

Please note article processing charges apply to papers accepted for publication in Royal Society Open Science (<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rsos/charges>). Charges will also apply to papers transferred to the journal from other Royal Society Publishing journals, as well as papers submitted as part of our collaboration with the Royal Society of Chemistry (<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rsos/chemistry>). Fee waivers are available but must be requested when you submit your revision (<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rsos/waivers>).

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Royal Society Open Science and we look forward to receiving your revision. If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards,
Royal Society Open Science Editorial Office
Royal Society Open Science
openscience@royalsociety.org

on behalf of Prof Pete Smith (Subject Editor)
openscience@royalsociety.org

Reviewer comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author(s)

It was an absolute pleasure to read this manuscript "Contours of citizen science". One of the most well-executed papers I've read in some time, and will definitely help the field of citizen science and also contribute to our understanding of what that "field" looks like! I think the figures, interpretation, and conclusions were all excellent. I also like how they treated the term 'citizen science' in the introduction. A great perspective.

Only because I feel like I should have at least one "comment" ...

When I was reading through the introduction, it didn't jump out at me who the audience was of the survey. It looks like it was somewhat general, but in the end it was mostly people like myself I assume who work in the field of citizen science - either running projects, analyzing data, academics etc. And this is a source of bias in the survey participants results. This is totally fine, but I think just potentially worth highlighting how this was set up and why these were the targets. On a side note, would be interesting to repeat this, but target the contributors to the citizen science projects a bit more heavily!

Regardless, great stuff, and I look forward to citing it in my future work.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author(s)

1. The justification for the use of vignette is not convincing enough because the paper failed to present other available options.
2. The use of past experience without mention of personal characteristics as basis of judgment need to be explained.

===PREPARING YOUR MANUSCRIPT===

Your revised paper should include the changes requested by the referees and Editors of your manuscript. You should provide two versions of this manuscript and both versions must be provided in an editable format:

one version identifying all the changes that have been made (for instance, in coloured highlight, in bold text, or tracked changes);

a 'clean' version of the new manuscript that incorporates the changes made, but does not highlight them. This version will be used for typesetting.

Please ensure that any equations included in the paper are editable text and not embedded images.

Please ensure that you include an acknowledgements' section before your reference list/bibliography. This should acknowledge anyone who assisted with your work, but does not qualify as an author per the guidelines at <https://royalsociety.org/journals/ethics-policies/openness/>.

While not essential, it will speed up the preparation of your manuscript proof if you format your references/bibliography in Vancouver style (please see <https://royalsociety.org/journals/authors/author-guidelines/#formatting>). You should include DOIs for as many of the references as possible.

If you have been asked to revise the written English in your submission as a condition of publication, you must do so, and you are expected to provide evidence that you have received language editing support. The journal would prefer that you use a professional language editing service and provide a certificate of editing, but a signed letter from a colleague who is a native speaker of English is acceptable. Note the journal has arranged a number of discounts for authors using professional language editing services (<https://royalsociety.org/journals/authors/benefits/language-editing/>).

===PREPARING YOUR REVISION IN SCHOLARONE===

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rsos> and enter your Author Centre - this may be accessed by clicking on "Author" in the dark toolbar at the top of the

page (just below the journal name). You will find your manuscript listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions". Under "Actions", click on "Create a Revision".

Attach your point-by-point response to referees and Editors at Step 1 'View and respond to decision letter'. This document should be uploaded in an editable file type (.doc or .docx are preferred). This is essential.

Please ensure that you include a summary of your paper at Step 2 'Type, Title, & Abstract'. This should be no more than 100 words to explain to a non-scientific audience the key findings of your research. This will be included in a weekly highlights email circulated by the Royal Society press office to national UK, international, and scientific news outlets to promote your work.

At Step 3 'File upload' you should include the following files:

-- Your revised manuscript in editable file format (.doc, .docx, or .tex preferred). You should upload two versions:

- 1) One version identifying all the changes that have been made (for instance, in coloured highlight, in bold text, or tracked changes);
- 2) A 'clean' version of the new manuscript that incorporates the changes made, but does not highlight them.

-- An individual file of each figure (EPS or print-quality PDF preferred [either format should be produced directly from original creation package], or original software format).

-- An editable file of each table (.doc, .docx, .xls, .xlsx, or .csv).

-- An editable file of all figure and table captions.

Note: you may upload the figure, table, and caption files in a single Zip folder.

-- Any electronic supplementary material (ESM).

-- If you are requesting a discretionary waiver for the article processing charge, the waiver form must be included at this step.

-- If you are providing image files for potential cover images, please upload these at this step, and inform the editorial office you have done so. You must hold the copyright to any image provided.

-- A copy of your point-by-point response to referees and Editors. This will expedite the preparation of your proof.

At Step 6 'Details & comments', you should review and respond to the queries on the electronic submission form. In particular, we would ask that you do the following:

-- Ensure that your data access statement meets the requirements at

<https://royalsociety.org/journals/authors/author-guidelines/#data>. You should ensure that you cite the dataset in your reference list. If you have deposited data etc in the Dryad repository, please only include the 'For publication' link at this stage. You should remove the 'For review' link.

-- If you are requesting an article processing charge waiver, you must select the relevant waiver option (if requesting a discretionary waiver, the form should have been uploaded at Step 3 'File upload' above).

-- If you have uploaded ESM files, please ensure you follow the guidance at

<https://royalsociety.org/journals/authors/author-guidelines/#supplementary-material> to include a suitable title and informative caption. An example of appropriate titling and captioning may be found at https://figshare.com/articles/Table_S2_from_Is_there_a_trade-off_between_peak_performance_and_performance_breadth_across_temperatures_for_aerobic_sc_ope_in_teleost_fishes_/3843624.

At Step 7 'Review & submit', you must view the PDF proof of the manuscript before you will be able to submit the revision. Note: if any parts of the electronic submission form have not been completed, these will be noted by red message boxes.

Author's Response to Decision Letter for (RSOS-202108.R0)

See Appendix A.

Decision letter (RSOS-202108.R1)

We hope you are keeping well at this difficult and unusual time. We continue to value your support of the journal in these challenging circumstances. If Royal Society Open Science can assist you at all, please don't hesitate to let us know at the email address below.

Dear Dr Haklay,

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript entitled "Contours of citizen science: a vignette study" is now accepted for publication in Royal Society Open Science.

Please ensure that you send to the editorial office an editable version of your accepted manuscript, and individual files for each figure and table included in your manuscript. You can send these in a zip folder if more convenient. Failure to provide these files may delay the processing of your proof. You may disregard this request if you have already provided these files to the editorial office.

If you have not already done so, please remember to make any data sets or code libraries 'live' prior to publication, and update any links as needed when you receive a proof to check - for instance, from a private 'for review' URL to a publicly accessible 'for publication' URL. It is good practice to also add data sets, code and other digital materials to your reference list.

You can expect to receive a proof of your article in the near future. Please contact the editorial office (openscience@royalsociety.org) and the production office (openscience_proofs@royalsociety.org) to let us know if you are likely to be away from e-mail contact -- if you are going to be away, please nominate a co-author (if available) to manage the proofing process, and ensure they are copied into your email to the journal. Due to rapid publication and an extremely tight schedule, if comments are not received, your paper may experience a delay in publication.

Please see the Royal Society Publishing guidance on how you may share your accepted author manuscript at <https://royalsociety.org/journals/ethics-policies/media-embargo/>. After publication, some additional ways to effectively promote your article can also be found here <https://royalsociety.org/blog/2020/07/promoting-your-latest-paper-and-tracking-your-results/>.

On behalf of the Editors of Royal Society Open Science, thank you for your support of the journal and we look forward to your continued contributions to Royal Society Open Science.

Kind regards,
Royal Society Open Science Editorial Office
Royal Society Open Science
openscience@royalsociety.org

on behalf of Pete Smith (Subject Editor)
openscience@royalsociety.org

Follow Royal Society Publishing on Twitter: @RSocPublishing

Follow Royal Society Publishing on Facebook:

<https://www.facebook.com/RoyalSocietyPublishing.FanPage/>

Read Royal Society Publishing's blog:

<https://royalsociety.org/blog/blogsearchpage/?category=Publishing>

Appendix A

Dear Editorial Team of Royal Society Open Science,

Many thanks for your handling of the reviewing process of this paper. We are pleased to read that the reviewers have appreciated the paper and provided useful comments that are helping us with improving the final version of the paper.

We have provided the following files. The file `author_tex.tex` is an editable version of the paper. The changes that were made to the paper can be found searching “Revised text” in the document. To assist this process, we provide two PDFs. In them, you’ll find that we have addressed Reviewer 1 comments on Pages 2 and 13 (bottom of the page), while Reviewer 2 comments are addressed on pages 10 (justification for the methodology) and 13.

We uploaded all the images as EPS files and that are associated with the TeX file.

The tables are uploaded as Word document. However, notice that for Table 1 and Table 3, we have used the BibTeX format for referencing the source. As you will see in the PDF, this is handled appropriately in the TeX compilation.

All the files that are needed for the production are also available at <https://www.overleaf.com/7476765929pnvqdvrszsn> and we will be happy to assist you in any way to see this paper published.

Many thanks for your work!

Muki Haklay and the authors.