



EGUsphere, referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-357-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on egusphere-2022-357

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee 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-RC2>, 2022

The manuscript concerns recommendations towards successful art-science collaborations in the geosciences, based on the experience from stakeholders in two case study projects. This is certainly within the scope of Geoscience Communication and would be of interest to its readership. However, at present I feel the article is rather confused and also tends to overclaim the applicability of its results given its limited scope. Therefore, I would recommend major revisions are required for it to be suitable for publication. The authors might also consider whether the GC Insights format is most suitable for what they are aiming to present.

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), which are largely uncited in the manuscript. This seems like a massive oversight to this reviewer and

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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