RESPONSE TO REFEREE 2

Line 74 – Is the focus on "young" women? I suggest removing the term young. While I understand the context, you don't report age in your dataset nor do you define what is meant by the term young.

The focus is on women, 'young' has been removed.

Line 83 – are there any demographics on the 58 exploratory survey participants? These would be good to include if you have them - there may be a systematic variation in participants responses based on gender, contract type, location etc that would be interesting to understand. Reading ahead I can see that some of this data is provided at L.146. It would make more sense to present all the demographic data in the same section or to be consistent in the way it's reported – for example, you could present the demographic data for the focus group immediately before you present the results for the focus group, since you follow that format for the survey and workshop data.

For consistency, all demographic data is now presented in Section 3 at the point where the data step is first metioned. Thus, data on the survey respondents has moved up from its original location (Line 146 in original manuscript) to its current location in Table 1 (beginning at Line 90). Information on workshop participants and focus group participants follows in sequence.

Table 1 – most of the participants are post-doctoral researchers who may have a systematically different perspective than those on permanent contracts. I will be interested to see in the discussion if the responses from the two contract groups are compared.

The study was exploratory in nature and not designed to compare experiences by contract status. Thus, the thematic analysis was conducted across the focus-group dataset rather than by employment subgroup. We have added a discussion of the potential of comparative analysis for future research in the Limitations section (Line 504-505).

Figure 1 – It would be good to know the maximum word frequency or have a scale or legend on the world cloud so that it is possible to determine what proportion of respondents used the most common words.

Figures 2 - 4 –The word "successful" should not be included in these word clouds since the word successful is part of the question that was put to the participants. It would be quite natural for a participant to repeat back part of the question in their response to you.

L154-159 and figures 2-4 – These terms need further explanation. For example, with the term "industry" I don't know whether participants were saying that successful geoscientists work in industry or they do research with industry or applied to industry. Likewise, when they say research are they saying that a successful geoscientist has a job in research or is good at doing

research? I find the terms need definition as there are multiple possible interpretations. Not just the two I mentioned here, all of the terms need definition. It would be good to have some quotes from the participants that clarify the way that these terms were employed.

> *We considered this feedback on Figures 1-4 (word clouds) and the associated text (L154 to 159 in original manuscript) in conjunction with feedback on word clouds from Reviewer 1. When attempting to address the issues raised above, it became clear that fixing the wordclouds was not the main issue. On rview, it was clear that they offered a truncated, overly simplistic and incomplete snapshot of information from the surveys and did not adequately present the relationship between the surveys, the workshop and the focus group development. Thus, we decided to remove the wordclouds and replace them with a more coherent and robust discussion of the survey data and its relationship to the workshop and subsequent focus groups.*

L180 – Where are the iGeo workshop data? I can't find them. They should be presented in a similar way to the iCRAG summit data – demographic data and word clouds.

> *The demographic data for the iGeo workshop are included in Lines 95 to 96. The insights from the workshop are included in a fuller discussion of the relationship between the survey, the workshop and the development of the focus groups, in Section 4.1*

4.1 – Suggest to include the list of questions that were put to the participants.

> *The focus group prompts are now included in the Data availability section. In addition, a new section (4.1 in updated manuscript) has been added to more fully explain the relationship between the survey, the workshop and the focus group development.*

L185 – what do you mean by "highly gendered"? It is not obvious to me what is gendered about these statements. This term needs qualification and explanation. I also don't understand your assessment of the model as narrow. How are you determining this? I am guessing you are comparing it to a broader model that you picture in your mind, but how do we know that your broader model is better or more accurate? Perhaps it would be better to delete this sentence, it seems to just be an opinion at this point because it is not qualified with any explanation or evidence.

> *This sentence was misleading and has been deleted.*

L186-7- I don't see any mention of metrics, research income, and international reputation in the word clouds. Is section 4.1 still discussing results from the workshop and survey? Or is this section from the main focus group? That needs to be made clear.

The subheadings have been updated to reflect the inclusion of Section 4.1, which explains the relationship between the survey, the workshop and the focus group development. An additional heading has been included to more clearly signal where analysis of focus group data begins (Section 4.2 in updated manuscript). Subsections are numbered accordingly (e.g. 4.2.1, 4.2.2 etc.).

L197 –The assessment of "sustained conformity to a demanding and highly competitive model of productivity" is not warranted given the evidence provided. The quotes just say that you need to get grants, publish papers and get a permanent position – none of the quotes say this is demanding or competitive. I don't think this is an accurate summary of what the participant's report. If the participant's said this you should provide the data (quotes) that indicate it. I note in the next sentence you say that one participant highlighted it was competitive. This quote should come before your assessment. If only one person said something like this I don't think it would be accurate you can imply that all participants or the majority of participants thought it - you currently state in the sentence "Participants understood… route to permanence was perceived as requiring sustained conformity etc." which implies multiple or most participants thought that.

We agree that the original wording moved too quickly from participants' identification of conventional markers of success to our interpretation of the demands associated with achieving that success. We have revised the paragraph to present the supporting evidence before making this interpretation and have added further quotations demonstrating that participants associated academic success with competition, sustained productivity, hard work, sacrifice and extended working hours. We have also removed the statement that younger participants and those on temporary contracts were particularly conscious of these pressures, as this was not necessary to the argument. The revised interpretation is therefore grounded in multiple participants' accounts rather than the single quotation presented previously.

L200 – Again, I don't think this summary reflects the data. They don't say anything about individual vs group and most of the quotes provided don't suggest that productivity needs to be perpetual and is unsustainable. I suggest using quotes that better reflect this observation/summary, or changing the summary to better reflect the quotes.

As discussed in relation to the previous point, this paragraph has been fully revised to better reflect the evidence provided by participants. Additional quotations have been included to support the interpretation of academic success as requiring sustained productivity and substantial demands on time, while the unsupported distinction between individual and collective academic practice has been removed. The summary has also been revised to ensure that the evidence is not over-interpreted and remains grounded in participants' accounts.

Typos or formatting errors:
Line 48 – there is a "50" at the beginning of the line that needs to be deleted

L316 – errant “320” in text

These have been remedied.