



EGUsphere, author comment AC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-357-AC2>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Reply on RC2

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-AC2>, 2022

---

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your review and comments regarding this manuscript. We greatly appreciate your feedback and will revise the manuscript accordingly. The following changes are noted in a point by point response below:

### General comments

*The introduction draws from only a small number of examples of art-science collaboration, hence does not seem to recognise the wide breadth of activity that has been occurring. Indeed, this journal has an entire Special Issue of examples ([https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/special\\_issue1046.html](https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/special_issue1046.html)), which are largely uncited in the manuscript. This seems like a massive oversight to this reviewer*

We have cited a number of articles from this Special Issue and agree that there is a wide variety of art-science collaborations occurring in this space. We will add further comment and references in the introduction to the Geoscience Communications Special Issue, "Five years of Earth sciences and art at the EGU (2015–2019)" to reflect the breadth of art-geoscience activity.

*The research aim of the article is not sufficiently well-stated to prepare readers to comprehend the manuscript. At times it appears that the authors wish to demonstrate the efficacy of art-science collaborations in co-creating knowledge and/or communicating important geoscience concepts to nonradiational audiences. At others, it seems they want to identify recommendations on how to enable successful collaborations between stakeholders in art-science collaborations (artists, scientists, exhibition staff). It is my opinion that the work cannot achieve the former, but may be able to demonstrate examples of the latter, though they will not be exhaustive due to the limited scope of the study. This should be much clearer in the abstract, introduction, and conclusions.*

The overall research aim was to provide recommendations on how to enable successful collaborations. We also hoped to highlight in the introduction the benefits that such opportunities can provide to audiences to contextualise our call for wider engagement in art-geoscience partnerships. We will adjust the abstract and introduction to specify that

our research aim was to provide recommendations on successful partnerships.

*The methods employed, as written, are rather unclear in the article. The fact that all results are drawn from just two case study projects only becomes apparent near the end of the manuscript. Exactly what the authors were looking to extract from their literature review and interview question development isn't stated - there are many vagueties such as simply stating "learning outcomes" and "information". How the interview data was processed to arrive at themes and conclusions is stated nowhere in the manuscript.*

We will make clear throughout the article the sample size for interviews and the number of case studies. The case studies will be moved to follow the Methods section to clarify this earlier. The research aim for the literature review and interviews will be more clearly stated in the introduction, as discussed above. Due to the short nature of a GC Insights piece, we had not added further detail regarding the interviews.

*The results, which are presented only as bullet point recommendations, are not adequately discussed. Their relation to the underlying data is not explained and no trends, even in which groups of stakeholders they originate, are stated. The discussions and conclusions are finally largely disconnected from the research activity, the interviews.*

We will adjust lines 53-65 to provide a more detailed introduction to our results from the interviews (the recommendations). Further, we will partly re-write the discussion to provide a more specific reflection on how the interview findings and case studies fed into these recommendations, also acknowledging limitations to the work.

### **Specific comments**

*L9 & 34: The claim that "environmental geosciences remain underrepresented in art-science partnerships" is not substantiated in the references provided, which correspond to a case study project and an editorial perspective. Only with a full survey or meta-analysis could this claim be substantiated, which does not appear to have occurred. Therefore, the authors should remove this claim as it misrepresents the work currently being done.*

The claim of underrepresentation was reflective of the Tooth et al. (2019) piece for a contemporary Art-Geoscience Special Issue that drew from the Tooth et al. (2016) article in Earth Surface Processes and Landforms. However, we acknowledge that this article for Geoscience Communication was not a full survey or meta-analysis and cannot fully substantiate this, so this shall be rephrased and the claim removed.

*Section 2: Overall this section is unclear, but also repetitive in many aspects. It could do with rewriting with a clear focus. Examples of unclear aspects are: What you were looking to find in literature review? How many people were identified to interview? What was the makeup? What was the criteria in identifying?; Who the "outcomes and impact" are meant to be on? If the stakeholders interviewed and their partners then that would be appropriate, however, if this is meant to concern the attendees then I do not agree that the study can adequately assess these.*

We will detail the specific aims and criteria for both the literature review and interviews in

this section, and adjust the content to be more concise.

*Case studies: These should be stated outright before any results are presented, so it provides much needed context to what the interview data is in relation to - their experiences of undertaking these two projects.*

The case studies will be moved to precede the results section and provide further context regarding the interview data. We will include text to clarify this link.

*Lines 53-65: These read like more introductory material unrelated to any results of the study, hence should be moved accordingly.*

These lines summarise findings of our literature review, though we acknowledge they may be better suited to the introduction. We will rework the relevant content to be included in the introduction instead of the results section.

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.