



Patrick, Lee &lt;patricl@miamioh.edu&gt;

---

## [CSTP] Mobile Apps and Beach Clean-ups: Tapping Into New Technologies to Promote Local Environmental Stewardship

---

Patrick, Lee <patricl@miamioh.edu>  
To: preece@umd.edu  
Cc: sayzie@citizenscience.org

Fri, May 1, 2020 at 4:22 PM

Dr. Preece,

Thank you so much for so quickly scanning my paper and providing this constructive feedback!! I think all of what you said is spot-on and completely helpful for me in terms of outlining what I can do to make my paper more substantial and review-worthy. When I first conducted my project and wrote a class reflection paper on the experience, I really didn't know that I'd eventually try to flesh it out for journal submission. I'm definitely interested in the topic of citizen science and technology, and also interested in doing some follow-up work related to my paper (when current circumstances with COVID-19 eventually allow).

Thank you again for your insightful feedback and openness to consider a re-submission from me in the future.

Kind regards and stay well,  
Lee

Lee Patrick  
Advanced Inquiry Program  
[patricl@miamioh.edu](mailto:patricl@miamioh.edu)  
[Lpwah1@gmail.com](mailto:Lpwah1@gmail.com)

On Wed, Apr 29, 2020 at 5:36 PM Jenny J Preece <[no-reply@ubiquitypartnernetnetwork.com](mailto:no-reply@ubiquitypartnernetnetwork.com)> wrote:

Dear Lee,

Thank you for submitting a case study to Citizen Science: Theory and Practice. You are correct that your paper fits within the scope of the journal and also that it is best presented as a case study. However, at present your study is rather small in terms of both the number of people involved in the study and the amount of time that the group spent collecting trash of the beach. Therefore, I have not sent your case study out for review as I don't think it will review well as it stands. There are several things that you might like to consider to improve the paper and then, you could upload a new version, which I will review and decide whether it should be more fully reviewed for publication. I hope you will consider doing some of these things as I think your work will benefit and I would like to see it go out for review and get published.

1. I spent quite a bit of time looking through the case studies that have been published recently. This helped me to reach a conclusion about whether to send your paper for review. I suggest that you should do the same. You will find a tab named "issues" on the home page of the journal. Try looking at the case studies and compare them with your work. I think you will see that the case studies published recently are larger in scope than your study.
2. Before submitting to a journal that you haven't submitted to before, I suggest that you look at what others have written about the topic. I agree that there isn't much about beach cleanup as you mentioned. This is good news as it means that your paper can fill an important gap. However, there are papers that focus on participation and what motivates people to participate. In fact, this is a key topic in this field. Your paper would be greatly strengthened by discussing some of the ideas in your paper in more detail and in reference to papers that have already been published on the topic. You have done some of this already but I suggest that you should do more. One of the

interesting findings that you point out that I haven't read a lot about before, is that your participants seemed a little frustrated that their inability to clean more of the beach, which was hampered by the citizen science aspects of the projects. That's interesting and I wonder what could be done about it?

3. The number of people involved in your study and the duration of the study is short, as I have said. This is a fairly major short-coming in my opinion. Is it possible that you could repeat the study, and maybe follow-up with more interviews about the issue of not being able to clean the beach as much as they would have liked because of the citizen science. That would add an interesting aspect to your project. Typically in projects that involve just a few participants researchers also go more deeply into the kind of people that were involved (e.g., age, occupation, gender, experience of citizen science). You don't provide those details. Also I wonder why only the extreme frisbee players joined the project. Was it because they know you - what's the story?

4. Another aspect that you can say much more about is the role of technology. You don't show any screen shots to illustrate the software that you used - readers like to see these. Further, you very briefly mention some of the features that participants liked and some that they did not like. You could say much more about these. Your paper is partly about the role of technology in this citizen science project and yet you say very little about the technology that you use. The role of technology in citizen science is an important topic and one that reviewers and readers will be very interested in. Further, this journal has a low focus on technology so here is an area where your paper can shine. You might want to look at Wiggins et al., 2011 which is published in this journal. You could also try looking at work by Jessie Oliver and I have written on this topic. There are several papers in Human-Computer Interaction journals on this topic.

So to conclude, I think you have an interesting topic but it needs more work to become a more substantial paper. I hope my suggestions are helpful and I hope you will continue to work on the paper and then resubmit it.

With best wishes,

Jennifer Preece (Editor-in-Chief, Citizen Science: Theory and Practice)

---

Citizen Science: Theory and Practice

<http://theoryandpractice.citizenscienceassociation.org/>