

Data Paper

Kazuyuki Saito, Go Iwahana, Hiroki Ikawa, Hirohiko Nagano, and Robert Busey. Spatiotemporally continuous temperature monitoring using optical fibers (Loop1) in the internal forest areas in Alaska for the period from 2017 to 2019. *Polar Data Journal*. 2024, 8, p. 10–22. <https://doi.org/10.20575/00000052>.

(Received 10/19/2023; Accepted 1/22/2024)

1st submission

Editor Start Date: 11/12/2023

Editor Stop Date: 12/3/2023

Reviewer #1 (11/15/2023–12/3/2023)

Reviewer #2 (11/29/2023–11/29/2023)

Editor-In-Chief comments to the Author: Akira Kadokura

As the reviewer #2 and handling editor point out, please explain and describe clearly in the manuscript about the reason why the authors would like to submit and publish this manuscript separately from the previous paper (<http://doi.org/10.20575/00000049>).

Handling editor comments to the Author: Ryu Uemura

It is unclear why was the manuscript submitted separately from Saito et al. (PDJ, 2023)? Why do the authors want to submit and publish it separately? If it is an appropriate reason, I recommend explaining the reason briefly in the text. The text reads as if the sensor system was replaced, but I could not clearly understand it.

Reviewer #1: Anonymous

I understand that the paper is sequel of the previous data papers by the authors. The description is basically already established in the previous time. To my view, it is appropriate, and I found no particular parts that require correction.

Reviewer #2: Anonymous

I reviewed a similar data paper by the same author team (<http://doi.org/10.20575/00000049>). The period of the published data was 2015-2016, and I find that this manuscript under review is merely the extension of the data period 2017-2019. I do not understand why the authors did not add these data (2017-2019) into the previously published data, which was submitted and reviewed in April of this year (2023). I suspect that this is separately submitted to increase

the number of publications by the authors. I have no interest in such behavior so no idea whether this should be rejected or can be published. But because of the reason above, I have no recommendation for this data though I chose "accept" in the recommendation box (because I cannot choose "No Recommendation"). It is up to the policy of the editorial board.

Authors Response:

We thank the time and efforts of the editors and two reviewers. The issue raised by the reviewer #2 and the handling editor helped us to clarify the specificity and the circumstances of the dataset of the submitted manuscript. Since this is virtually the only issue we replied comprehensively (in red) at the bottom of this correspondence.

Editor-In-Chief: As the reviewer #2 and handling editor point out, please explain and describe clearly in the manuscript about the reason why the authors would like to submit and publish this manuscript separately from the previous paper (<http://doi.org/10.20575/00000049>).

Handling editor: It is unclear why was the manuscript submitted separately from Saito et al. (PDJ, 2023)? Why do the authors want to submit and publish it separately? If it is an appropriate reason, I recommend explaining the reason briefly in the text. The text reads as if the sensor system was replaced, but I could not clearly understand it.

Reviewer #1: I understand that the paper is sequel of the previous data papers by the authors. The description is basically already established in the previous time. To my view, it is appropriate, and I found no particular parts that require correction.

Reviewer #2: I reviewed a similar data paper by the same author team (<http://doi.org/10.20575/00000049>). The period of the published data was 2015-2016, and I find that this manuscript under review is merely the extension of the data period 2017-2019. I do not understand why the authors did not add these data (2017-2019) into the previously published data, which was submitted and reviewed in April of this year (2023). I suspect that this is separately submitted to increase the number of publications by the authors. I have no interest in such behavior so no idea whether this should be rejected or can be published. But because of the reason above, I have no recommendation for this data though I chose "accept" in the recommendation box (because I cannot choose "No Recommendation"). It is up to the policy of the editorial board.

This set of the data (ADS ID: A20231019-001 together with A20190625-002, A20190625-003, and A20191021-001) is the third and the last portion of the series of the measurement conducted from 2012 to 2019, of which the previous two sets of data, covering the respective period of 2012 to 2014 and 2015 to 2016 were already archived as ADS ID: A20190521-001 (corresponding paper DOI: 10.5194/gi-7-223-2018) and as ADS ID: A20190625-001 (corresponding paper DOI: 10.20575/00000049).

We archived this portion of the data separately from those previous datasets at the ADS because of substantial interruptions in between, differences in the spatial extent of the sensor cable, and the consequential deterioration of the quality-controlled data.

In replying to the comments from the reviewer and the editors, we added in the manuscript the following explanations on the above reasons why we archived this dataset separately. The line numbers denote the lines in the changes-tracked version of the manuscript, as attached at the end of the submitted material.

Abstract

ll. 26-37: We revised sentences to briefly explain the circumstances and conditions under which this portion of the data were collected, and added the description of reasons why this portion of the data were archived separately from the previous ones.

1. Background & Summary

ll. 40-51: We added a detailed explanation of the circumstances and conditions under which this portion of the data were collected, and added the reason why this portion of the data were archived separately from the previous ones.

5. Technical Validation

ll. 159-163: We added the explanation of a different practice in technical validation performed to this portion of the data and its reason.

We submitted the original manuscript separately to make a one-to-one correspondence between an archived dataset and the description paper. It is not our intention to proliferate the number of the published papers. We are very happy to follow a Polar Data Journal's policy on categories of the manuscript to distinguish a brand-new dataset and an amendment to a series of continuous recurring observations.

2nd submission

Editor Start Date: 12/26/2023

Editor Stop Date: 1/18/2024

Editorial Office's note

Calculate checksum date: 1/23/2024

Algorithm: SHA256

Hash link: <http://id.nii.ac.jp/1434/00000052> > hash list