# Response to reviews of resubmission “Wikidata and the bibliography of life”

Dear Gabriele Casazza,

Please find below my response to the reviews of the previous version of this manuscript. I confess I was a little taken aback by the category “major revisions” given the actual reviews.

**Reviewer 1** (David Shotton) made a series of suggestions for tweaking the text and the caption to Table 1, all of which I have done as requested. He regarded the manuscript as suitable for publication.

**Reviewer 2** (anonymous) regards the manuscript as improved if a little long. I found the comments to be rather vague, and in places asking for more material in a manuscript that was already judged by this reviewer to be too long.

I think that this contribution could benefit from some forward thinking regarding its topic – where the author thinks greater effort in the future should be placed to produce the best outcomes, and how these should be brought about.

I think the manuscript addresses this, for example in its discussion of the importance of linking authors, and in pointing out that some growth will be the result of automated harvesting by existing bots.

Another comment – carried on from my previous review has to do with drawbacks / downsides of Wikidata as a repository of taxonomic publications? Unfortunately, not referring to my initial comment on this issue **does not fill me with confidence about your expertise on this topic**. Without thinking about this for **more than a few seconds** I can think of: ease of access, user interface, reputation, various biases (geographic, taxonomic, cultural, journal based, publication type), as well as expanding on some of the issues currently addressed in penultimate paragraph regarding the community nature of Wiki and its lack of centralized curation. Highlighting such issues and others (potentially with data to support them) will only serve to make this contribution more comprehensive and useful. Wikidata is not a panacea, it would be unwise to treat it as such. **(emphasis added)**

The comment “does not fill me with confidence about your expertise on this topic” seems unnecessary. I freely admit I have little expertise in assessing the biases affecting Wikidata, but I suspect their assessment requires more than “thinking about this for more than a few seconds”. There are all sorts of issues to be considered, such as how does one measure bias? Is it with respect to the source data (itself likely to be biased as the literature I cite in the final paragraph points out) or the background of the Wikidata community? I believe that in this manuscript I have acknowledge the issue and pointed the reader in the direction of relevant publications. Given that this reviewer already feels that the manuscript is long I not think it appropriate to attempt superficial coverage here, rather it deserves its own separate study.

Regarding the title and stressing throughout the term “bibliography of life” – I still maintain that this is a poor choice. I understand the desire to keep it – but this manuscript deals with a centralized repository of taxonomic papers. I think it would make much more sense to treat it as such, and this would not take anything away from this contribution. As a testament to this you now add a paragraph in the intro to explain why this particular title was chosen. This is not a good sign that the title should have been chosen to begin with.

This is simply a matter of opinion, the phrase is being used by others in my field, and Reviewer 1 is fine with the it. Can I suggest that we simply agree to disagree? If others judge the term to be a poor choice it will lapse soon enough.

Line 273 - so is Wikispecies the bibliography of life or Wikidata?

I think I make the answer to that question clear in the manuscript.

I hope you find the revision and responses to be satisfactory. My sense is that reviewer 1 is happy with the manuscript, and that reviewer 2 is more comfortable questioning my expertise than offering detailed, constructive comments.

Regards,

Rod Page