



I wish I had read this editorial at the start of my SciArt career

Louise Arnal (Referee)

Referee comment on "Editorial: Geoscience communication – planning to make it publishable" by John K. Hillier et al., Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-13-RC2>, 2021

This GC editorial builds on the first GC editorial by Illingworth et al. (2018), and provides a detailed route to publication aimed at geoscientists involved in geoscience communication activities. I found this editorial very insightful and a good balance between theory and illustrative examples of impactful GC publications. I wish I had read this editorial at the start of my SciComm/SciArt career during my PhD! Please find a few minor points below which will hopefully help improve this editorial for publication.

- P3 L74-77: The phrasing of these sentences makes the two first items: "complying with funders' requirements" and "communicating with relevant stakeholders", almost secondary and readers might dismiss them. I would suggest rephrasing the sentences to highlight the importance of all of these three valid points, and explicitly linking to sections of the paper that describe these points in more details.
- P3 L76-77: I found reading this sentence about contributing to building a field of geoscience communication a little bit intimidating. The first thought I had was that as I didn't get any training as a geoscience communicator, am I still entitled to contributing to the field's literature? You tackle this point really well later in the paper when you talk about collaborating on geoscience communication activities and outputs, but I was wondering if it might be helpful to allude to this already now, for readers like me?
- Section 3: Another approach I have seen many geoscientists follow is a mix of both approaches illustrated in Fig. 1, where the activity design is done following approach 1a, and later reframed to publish it following approach 1b. I was wondering if you could comment on this and whether it is desirable?
- P5 L133-135: I suggest changing "useful" to "applicable" or "impactful". The outcomes might probably still be useful for a certain end, but it might be harder to draw any impact retrospectively.
- P5 L152-154: Investigations of the dialogue and communication process is a great idea! Could you give an example or two of papers that do this well? A minor additional comment, I found this point slightly out of place here. Consider moving it (along with other recommendations) to a "further recommendations" section at the end of the paper if you think it would work well.

- P7 L199-201: I found defining what success looks like a very hard task when writing my first SciArt project proposals, and very different to anything I had written in science before (especially as an early career scientist who had never written a grant application). In science, "success" is very abstract in that an experiment might be successful either if it fails or if it works as expected, because both outcomes are scientific findings in their own right. Could you maybe elaborate a bit more on this task and/or provide some useful literature/resources on the topic to guide readers?

- P7 L212: Maybe reiterate here that they can be quantitative or qualitative data and give a few quick examples?

- P14 L428: Could you please define here what "network analysis" means?

- P15 L469: I would add that these forms can usually be found directly via one's institute, for readers wondering where to find them.

- Section 10: Here, you focus on GC publication as it is the target of this editorial. It might be worth noting here that widely accessible communication of research can also be achieved in different spaces using various formats to reach specific audiences, and that publishing in GC is the space and format you focus on here. E.g., Exhibition visitors who might not necessarily know about GC might find it interesting to find out about geoscientists' analysis of an exhibition via blog posts, a series of posts on social media, short videos, etc.

- Section 11: Are the points in this section in a specific order? I would swap some of them around (e.g., 2 and 3 before 1), so this led me to wonder if these were in a particular order.

- Figure 3: Consider adding a legend of what the different dots are on this figure. What is the fourth dot?

*Technical corrections:

- additional comma not needed before parenthesis is being closed.
- brackets not needed around "Hut et al."
- "to" can be removed.
- "ed" missing at the end of "recommend".