

Response to Reviewer Comments

I sincerely thank the reviewer for their thoughtful, constructive, and detailed evaluation of the manuscript. I greatly appreciate the time and expertise devoted to reviewing my work and offering valuable suggestions for improvement. I fully agree with the reviewer's assessments and have carefully considered each point raised. Below, I provide a point-by-point response outlining how the manuscript has been revised accordingly.

1. Does the paper address science historical matters within the scope of HGSS?

Reviewer: Yes.

Response: I am pleased that the manuscript is considered well aligned with the scope of the journal.

2. Does the paper present new historical research, new interpretations, or new compilations of historical issues or data, or new aspects of the vitae of important geoscientists?

Reviewer: Needs improvement.

Response: I agree with this assessment. In the revised version, Taşman's biography has been more explicitly framed within the broader history of geology and petroleum science in Türkiye. The novelty of the study has been strengthened by emphasizing the use of previously underexplored archival sources, including personal correspondence, institutional documents, and technical reports. These materials allow for a more integrated and original account of his scientific contributions, methodological innovations, and role in the early development of Türkiye's petroleum industry.

3. Are the historical methods clearly outlined and the historical sources clearly stated?

Reviewer: Yes.

Response: Thank you for this positive evaluation.

4. Do the authors give proper credit to related and previous work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?

Reviewer: Yes.

Response: Thank you.

5. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?

Reviewer: Needs revision.

Response: The title has been revised to more accurately reflect the manuscript's focus on Taşman's scientific contributions, methodological innovations, and his role within the context of Turkish petroleum geology and state-building.

6. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

Reviewer: Yes.

Response: Thank you.

7. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?

Reviewer: Revision.

Response: The manuscript has been restructured to improve narrative coherence, reduce repetition, and strengthen logical transitions between sections (education, scientific work, collaborations, and social context). The conclusion has also been rewritten to better synthesize the main arguments and findings.

8. Is the language fluent and precise?

Reviewer: Ok.

Response: Although the language was deemed acceptable, a thorough language revision was nevertheless undertaken to enhance clarity, precision, and academic tone throughout the manuscript.

9. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?

Reviewer: Yes.

Response: Redundant passages—particularly within the biographical sections—were removed or condensed. Figures were reviewed for relevance and clarity, and figure captions were expanded where necessary to improve interpretability.

Addressing Specific Comments

Pioneering Role and Scientific Contributions:

The discussion of Taşman's pioneering role has been expanded by detailing his methodological innovations (e.g., the integration of micropaleontology and geophysical surveys), specific discoveries (such as the Raman field), and his contributions to establishing professional standards and training practices. Where appropriate, comparisons with contemporary international practices have been supported by historical sources.

Education at Robert College and Columbia University:

Taşman's education has been contextualized within the broader framework of Ottoman/Turkish modernization and the influence of American pedagogical models on his scientific perspective. The previously unclear statement regarding U.S. influence has been rewritten for greater precision.

Name Consistency and Degree Information:

The spelling of “Djevad Eyoub” has been verified and standardized throughout the manuscript. Taşman's academic credentials have been clarified (B.S. in Mining Engineering), and confirmation regarding the completion of an M.S. degree has been explicitly addressed where relevant.

Collaborations and Team Science:

Greater emphasis has been placed on Taşman's collaborations with key figures such as Vonderschmidt, Page, and Berent, highlighting how these partnerships contributed to advances in exploration techniques in Türkiye.

Russian Comparison (p. 5, line 145):

This passage has been reconsidered and either substantiated with appropriate evidence or removed to avoid unsupported speculation.

Mindset Transformation and Social Context:

The manuscript now more clearly articulates the shift in geological methodologies and links social dimensions—such as oil camp living conditions and family life—to broader narratives of industrialization and professional culture in mid-20th-century Türkiye.

Incorporation of Suggested Sources:

Key references recommended by the reviewer, including Akcan (2024), Ergin (1957), and Sarigül (2021), have been incorporated to strengthen the historiographical framework and support the analysis.

Conclusion:

The conclusion has been substantially revised to underscore Taşman's historical significance by integrating his scientific, institutional, and social legacy into a coherent synthesis.

I thank the reviewer once again for their invaluable comments, which have significantly strengthened the manuscript. I am confident that the revised version offers a more rigorous, contextualized, and compelling contribution to the history of the geosciences. I look forward to submitting the revised manuscript for further consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Oğuz Müläyim