



EGUsphere, referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-505-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on egusphere-2022-505

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Analyzing The Factor and Work Model of Environmental Journalist in Renewable Energy" by Marlinda Irwanti Poernomo et al., EGU sphere,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-505-RC2>, 2022

Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of GC?

Yes

Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?

To some degree. There's a growing need for media analysis, particularly in the fast evolving world of energy and environmental journalism, and this paper addresses that. The methods used aren't particularly innovative but they can offer important insights.

Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?

Yes

Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?

Hard to say as the conclusions seem very vague and not very different from the premises of the paper itself - as a reader I can't quite pinpoint how the work has advanced the knowledge of this field or answered the research questions

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

Yes

Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?

Yes

Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

Structurally quite clear although it needs editing for language.

Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?

The structure is robust but the presentation remains unclear with a few problems - possibly due in part to the language barrier (see further comments at the end)

Is the language fluent and precise?

No, the language seems to be the main problem here, it makes it difficult to follow the authors' thought process

Are the number and quality of references appropriate?

Yes

General comment:

The subject of the paper is extremely interesting and greater investigation into the

practices of environmental journalism in South East Asia is much needed. However I would strongly recommend a round of robust edits before resubmitting the paper for review, to give the reviewer a chance to appreciate the authors' reasoning and conclusions.

More comments (on the highlighted paragraphs pasted below):

"The Sociologist Communication expert named Triyono Lukmantoro gives an overview of why environmental journalism does not get a good position in the media; he argues that environmental coverage requires particular skills and knowledge about non-human 40 aspects such as water, air, and land. Based on an environmental perspective, all of them have low quality"

So do many other beats? Business journalism has very often to do with non-human aspects for example, yet it's very popular.

"Then, several people mention that the term climate change has change into a climate crisis contextually 45 (Carrington, 2019). According to this threat, the world has found the alternative way to change the conventional fossil energy, which become the most significant threat of ozone depletion, the mantle layer of the earth's protective atmosphere, with renewable energy-based energy sources. It is inseparable from the fact that renewable energy sources are cleaner in releasing carbon emissions."

This is factually incorrect. The main drivers of ozone depletion are a family of gases known as Chlorofluorocarbons - global warming only plays an indirect part. See for example here: <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=63065>

"In depth-interview with several media journalists in this research, it was found that the main obstacle to environmental coverage felt by journalists was the limited number of sources and references in the coverage plan."

Why is this unique to the renewable energy beat? A lack of sources would be a problem for any kind of reporting, and usually has more to do with the networking abilities of a journalist than with the beat itself. I assume there is a reason why journalists in Indonesia struggle with finding sources in this particular field but the paper doesn't make them clear.