

Hello and thanks for your submitting your data entry! I am reviewing files and will be asking for your help to fix things that seem wrong. I apologize as I will probably send multiple entries on this as I find issues; please bear with me. And thanks again!

I am currently checking that ‘our definition’ of phenology is entered correctly and your name showed up in an entry that looked wrong (you’ll see that your entry indicates that our definition was tested, but other rows suggest this could not be correct)....

```
> seemswrong[,c("paper_id", "who_entered", "gsxgrowth", "gsl",
+               "gs_start_metric", "gs_end_metric", "gsxgrowthhours")]

```

	paper_id	who_entered	gsxgrowth	gsl
1:	Gao2022	Fredi	yes temperature or snow metric	
2:	Gao2022	Fredi	no temperature or snow metric	
3:	Sebastian-Azcona2020	rdm	not mentioned	not measured
4:	Zhu2021	Fredi	yes	not measured
5:	Zhu2021	Fredi	yes	not measured
6:	Brand2022	Alana	no	date

	gs_start_metric	gs_end_metric	gsxgrowthhours
1:	SOS	none	no
2:	SOS	none	no
3:	none	none	no
4:	none	none	no
5:	none	none	no
6:	September	April	no

I wonder if you did not mean ‘no’ and instead meant one of the other ‘no’ or ‘not’ options. Here’s a reminder of the metadata on this entry and possible entries:

ourdefinition_evidence_gslxgrowth: Did they find evidence that growth (whatever metric they used) increased with longer growing seasons. Their GSL metric must be: start to end of wood or vegetative growth (can include satellite data) or periods suitable for growth related to wood or vegetative growth (this latter case mainly for drought systems etc.). Suitable days CANNOT be the number of days they observed growth.

- yes
- no
- negative relationship
- no data for this
- not tested but have data
- not sure

Friendly tip! You may also want to check your entries for `authorsthink_evidence_gsxgrowth` and make sure your ‘no’ entries there meant ‘they tested and did not find a relationship.