

Response to Reviewer 2:

“This is a very timely article given that many (all) of us are grappling with interdisciplinarity and interdisciplinary ways of working. I very much enjoyed reading this from the perspective of ECRs. The approach/methodology utilised was appropriate, and it was good to see the team were aware of potential biases in their dataset. There is a good number of response on which the findings are based. This is a well-written piece. I particularly liked the 'sankey' diagrams for displaying the findings - visually these were very effective.”

We sincerely thank Reviewer 2 for the positive evaluation of the manuscript and for the relevance of the topic and the appropriateness of the methodology & result figures. These comments are greatly appreciated.

This article should be accepted for publication, with a few minor points to consider:

1. Could 'within' replace 'in' in the article title, and perhaps add 'the' before Geosciences.

We have added “the” to Geosciences. The “within” is perhaps not fully suitable, as we are discussing collaboration with neighbouring (adjacent) disciplines.

2. Within the Ethic Statement, is there an internal ethics approval code that can be quoted? This is typical in my institution, but I appreciate this may not be universal.

Thanks a lot for the question, yes there are some codes that can be quoted. In this case, we can connect directly to German law regulations. The text is adjusted to include this information:

“Data collection and processing complied with the German and European General Data Protection Regulation and the privacy and ethics agreement (in accordance with articles 12–14 GDPR) and followed standards at the GFZ Helmholtz Centre for Geosciences. The data privacy statement was developed with the help of the respective data protection officer. Participants were given the option to skip questions or withdraw from the survey at any time.”

3. Should Earth Sciences be defined to include physical geography, environmental sciences, and geology?

Based on a similar comment made by reviewer 1, we adjusted the sentence about the “umbrella of earth sciences” as follows:

“Sometimes, notably in English-speaking countries, these disciplines or at least a subset

are grouped under the umbrella of Earth Sciences, physical geography or geography (Orion, 2019; Orion and Libarkin, 2023).

4. Why a maximum 'academic age' of 20 years to reflect ECRs? Many funding schemes have a cut-off for ECRs of 8 years post-PhD. Can this be clarified?

A similar point was made by Reviewer 1. As mentioned in the reply to comments by reviewer one, we explicitly avoided excluding responses from scientists more than 8–10 years post-PhD (although the majority of our responses was from ECS with an academic age of 0 to 10 years). While ECS status is primarily defined by career stage rather than academic age alone, the survey also captured responses from participants beyond the typical ECS academic age range.

This was clarified in the manuscript as follows:

“To ensure the survey reflected the views of ECS, academic age was used as an operational proxy for career stage. Mind that ECS are defined as researchers in the early stages of their professional careers who have not yet reached a permanent or fully independent research position. A maximum academic age of 20 years was set to ensure broad inclusion, based on the distribution of participants (Fig. 2).”

5. As AI wasn't used to automatically extract categories (lines 128-130), does this need to be stated?

We agree that this can be omitted and have removed this sentence from the manuscript.

6. When did the Geo.X ECR retreat take place (line 74)? Can this be stated?

The retreat took place between the 12th to 15th of October, 2022 at Waldhotel Schmöckwitz in Berlin. This is now added to the manuscript and reads as follows:

“During a Geo.X ECS science retreat held in October 2022 in Berlin-Schmöckwitz, participants exchanged experiences and perspectives on interdisciplinary research.”

7. Replace 'roughly' with approximately, too colloquial, i.e., line 355.

Thanks. We substituted “roughly” with “approximately”.