

Reviewer 1

This manuscript presents a valuable discussion, but it is ill suited to a scientific journal. I would recommend publication in another outlet such as Fire Learning Network “Notes from the Field” or Wildfire Today. If the authors are intent on publishing in Fire, I would recommend collecting data from multiple workshops with a more rigorous social science framework.

We appreciate that the reviewer recognizes the value of the discussion. In fact, the alternative outlets provided align nicely with the specific section of the journal Fire to which we have submitted. The section “Fire Research at the Science–Policy–Practitioner Interface” has as a goal “to facilitate the sharing of information between wildland fire managers and scientists,” specifically by engaging fire science information networks such as the Tallgrass Prairie & Oak Savanna Fire Science Consortium, which funded the workshop and for which two authors of this submission are management team members. It was made clear that reports of this nature are well within the scope of the Section when it was launched. In addition, the journal’s aims and scope recognize a past focus on research assessing vegetation fire impacts on landscapes, but state they have broadened the scope to explicitly include, “case studies highlighting significant fire events or examples of governmental or community-based fire management.” While it would be great to conduct multiple workshops and compare them with a rigorous social science framework, until the Joint Fire Science Program gives Fire Science Exchange Networks enough money to pull that off, we offer this valuable discussion of our workshop so that others might learn from it when planning their own.

The authors and editors need to improve the clarity on what type of paper this is. The manuscript states it is a ‘Feature Paper’ but based on the Instructions for Authors webpage for Fire, it looks to me like a “Case Report”.

We appreciate the reviewer’s accurate point. The submission does fall better into the Case Report category, and we’ve updated the header. “Feature Paper” was used in the initial submission simply because the piece was invited by journal staff using that language.

Perhaps comments from the other reviewers and me will help make this manuscript ready for publication in Fire, but I believe it is better suited to a different outlet.

Depending on the views of the editor and other reviewers, one option might be to significantly shortening the introduction. Paring down the introduction could remove some areas that are really beyond the scope of the paper and would give more focus to the case study. It is the Dunn Ranch case study that is the real importance of the paper. The conclusion is based the authors opinions and not necessarily transferrable to other workshops.

We trust the reviewer will agree that the other reviewers and editor have offered strong support for both the topic and the present format. Note that the second reviewer essentially argues against paring down the Introduction at the risk of presenting too narrow of a discussion that misses the opportunity to address broader pedagogical issues that are clearly at play in this, or

any other potential, workshop. Upon invitation, the topic was pitched to journal staff specifically within Fire's "Fire Research at the Science–Policy–Practitioner Interface" Section to serve a similar function as "Notes from the Field".

Overall, the manuscript would benefit from another edit to make the writing more succinct and easier to read. If this manuscript is to be published in Fire, extraneous details from the case study should be excised. For example, though humorous, line 226's discussion of gravy doesn't fit in a scientific journal. The goal should be to provide the reader with the key elements that made the workshop successful. For example, it would be better to simply indicate organizers ensured sufficient food rather than providing the details of food logistics.

The reviewer is correct, there is no room for humor in scientific journals. Humorous reference to gravy supply has been removed :(

Specific comments

Line 67 to 69: Given this could be a controversial statement, it would be good to have a citation. I believe some of the papers on barriers to prescribed fire might be appropriate citations (perhaps even Kobziar et al 2009 though expanding to other papers would be good).

We added a citation to support the "controversial" statement.

Line 113: A paper that might be useful to include in section 1.3:

Hunter, M.E., Colavito, M.M., Wright, V., 2020. The Use of Science in Wildland Fire Management: a Review of Barriers and Facilitators. Curr. For. Reports. 6, 354–367. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40725-020-00127-2>

Great suggestion, we regret having overlooked this in our literature review. We have used it at the point below where the reviewer suggests adding a citation to this section.

Figure 4. This figure needs further refinement or a better explanation to be useful to the reader. For example, is it suggesting that experience is four times more important than education? Is science less important than management as suggested but the size of the circles?

We appreciate the reviewer's comments and share their concerns. We've removed this figure, having determined that it does not add value beyond what has already been presented in the text.

Line 132 needs a citation

The reviewer makes a great point; this is where we've cited the Hunter et al. 2020 reference provided above.

Line 141: TNC's adaptation of ICS seems more important than just a parenthetical comment. Could more detail and/or a citation be provided?

We appreciate that the reviewer sees the value in this fact, and we have broken up the sentence and removed the fact from parentheses, to give it more emphasis. It is unclear what additional detail might be useful here. The main point is about scientists being kept away from firelines due to greater ICS adoption by NGOs, with TNC given as an example. We do not have a citation for the fact, which was given here under the authority of the TNC fire management officer on our author list.

Line 153: this sentence could be rewritten to be easier to read.

We appreciate the reviewer's attention to clarity in the writing. Without specific suggestions, like they provided below, it is difficult to determine what about the sentence made it difficult to read, but we've attempted to edit for clarity in the spirit of the reviewer's comment.

Line 167 to 177 This paragraph could be rewritten to be much more succinct. The same is true for the follow paragraph. For example "As such, the workshop was formally run as an Incident just as any other prescribed fire or wildfire response would be conducted." Could be simplified to: "The workshop was run as an incident just like any other prescribed fire or wildfire response." More direct language would make the manuscript easier to read.

Again, we appreciate the reviewer's attention to clarity. While we agree that being succinct is a strong quality in writing and that being succinct generally involves using fewer words, at the end of the day the text needs to flow and be engaging, especially when written for a broader, less-scientific audience, as is the case here. From that perspective, we've made the specific changes requested here, but the reviewer's overall point seems based on stylistic opinions with a marginal influence on the word count that exceed the scope of a technical review. If there are other specific areas of text where the reviewer feels we could be more succinct while still retaining style and flow appropriate to a broad audience, we welcome the suggestion.

Line 180: I'm not sure MDPI's policy on hyperlinks versus citations, but I'd suggest giving citation along with the hyperlink for Position Taskbooks.

The reviewer raises a good point. The revised submission uses source files modified by MDPI staff following the review and anticipate the production team will update or advise as necessary.

Line 196: TREXs deserve more explanation. While familiar to many readers, others need another sentence or two of description and a citation (e.g. Spencer 2015 which is cited later).

TREX was initially described and cited well above, in L 111-112.

Figure 11 needs to include the number of respondents

The reviewer makes an excellent point. We've added this information.

Section 4.4 The discussion of weakness is of limited use (and certainly not scientifically valid) because of the small number of respondents.

The reviewer is overly pessimistic about the value of the discussion of the weaknesses, although in the interest of making the paper flow better we've retained the figure but only in the Appendix. The number of respondents is the same as the rest of the survey data—the fact that very few identified obstacles in the operation is itself useful information and evidence of overall success, which is highlighted by the “none” bars. It merits discussion of the obstacles that were identified, even by just one respondent, to better improve.

The conclusion seems entirely based on the authors opinions rather than data.

The reviewer is correct, the conclusions of this case study based on a workshop and its evaluation are in fact derived from the opinions of BOTH the attendees (as expressed in the post-workshop survey) AND the facilitators who conducted and evaluated the workshop, who are also the authors of this case study.