



EGUsphere, author comment AC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-357-AC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC1

Rosalie A. Wright et al.

Author comment on "GC Insights: Enhancing inclusive engagement with the geosciences through art–science collaborations" by Rosalie A. Wright et al., EGU sphere,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-357-AC1>, 2022

Dear Tiziana,

Thank you very much for your review and comments regarding this manuscript. We greatly appreciate your feedback and will revise the manuscript accordingly. We will make the following changes, noted in a point by point response below, relating to the comments:

The research presented in this GC Insight is conducted with a limited sample: a small group of participants. This is not immediately clear from the article, and become evident only in the supplement.

- We will make clear throughout the article the exact sample size of interviews. The case studies will be moved to follow the Methods section and provide further context to the interviews.

The other important aspect comes out from the case studies, and I believe it is not enough emphasized in the article: integrating Art in "unusual" context as can be a Museum of Natural History (case #1) or in a political context (case #2) can contribute in engaging with geosciences in a powerful way? I believe this aspect is worth to be explored more in depth.

- We also believe that these more "unusual" contexts are important to highlight and explore. We believe that we emphasised the benefits of the more unusual Museum setting in lines 92-94, though we will add text to highlight the specific value of the Museum context in our discussion.

10-11 I suggest: "Here we present two cases studies as examples of how co-creating approaches for reaching wider audiences..."

- Thank you for the suggestion, we will revise this line accordingly.

41-42 Please make immediately clear that people interviewed are three. 66-80 This is a repetition of what already summarized in the supplement 98 (Fig. S2 in the supplement)

- We will clarify the interview sample size earlier in the article. Lines 66 to 80 will be adjusted to remove repetitions of what is included in the supplement.

Part 4 should be reorganized. Rather than being a collection of references to other works, it should summarize and discuss what your team has achieved in collaborating and co-creating, what can be further explored, and the limits of your work (if there are).

- Part 4 will be partly re-written to more specifically summarise and reflect upon our work, in addition to the inclusion of text addressing the limitations of this work.

Thank you again for your guidance on this manuscript, it is much appreciated. Please let us know if you have any additional questions and thank you for the opportunity to submit our work for your consideration.