Replies to referee comments

We have completed the revision of our submission *4632*. We note that both authors answered *Yes* to the question about the ability of our article to have an impact on the subject of area. Other than that, the two referees raised several valid issues, which we thoroughly addressed. We would like to thank them for helping strengthening our point.

Reviewer 1 (Jones)

As ref. 1 points out, most of our paper discusses recent advances in our behaviour regarding data sharing. This is done *on purpose*. On one hand, previous forum papers on the subject have already been reviewed and synthesized, and as such there is no interest in reproducing the exercise. On the other hand, it's hard to argue against the fact that the playing field of data-sharing has changed *a lot* in the recent years. The last two years alone saw the apparition of *figshare*, changes in policy of several journals and societies (notably the BES) regarding open data, and more broadly, the rise of an ecosystem of open-source projects leveraging these open datasets.

These aspects now need to be addressed, and this is the objective of our paper: to ensure that the discussion around open-data accounts for these practical and technological developments. **We reinforced this aspect on the revision of our paper**.

%DG: I think you need to clearly specify where you have made changes and what kind of changes

Ref. 1 argues against JSON as a robust format for data interchange. This is a surprising position, for several reasons. JSON, over several other formats proposed by the referee, can be validated against schemes (in addition to the fact that, contrary to CSV, it has a formal specification). This ensures that the data are syntactically correct. In addition, the scheme describes the data format and typing, and as such serves as its own data-specification. Although a JSON object is, as the ref. says, not self-descriptive, the combination of JSON and a scheme, with the possibility of automatic validation, is. Regardless of the quality check allowed by JSON + schemes, this format emerged as a *de facto* standard for API, which already are the favoured way to interact with large, open datasets. Because the referee's comment was perhaps consequent to an incomplete argumentation about JSON in the previous version, **we reinforced the case for JSON in the paper**.

The referee's point about *archiving* vs. *sharing* reflects its own opinion. As this is an opinion paper, we accept the risk of not reaching consensus with some readers. **We kept the incriminated part, but reinforced our point**.

Reviewer 2 (Moles)

This reviewer submitted a response paper, and our comments on her argument are given in the *Response to referees* section of the re-submitted manuscript.