Geosci. Commun. Discuss., referee comment RC3
https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-24-RC3, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on gc-2021-24

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "GC Insights: Scientists as Marketers" by Iain S. Stewart, Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-24-RC3, 2021

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. The author offers a (somewhat) temporal account of the evolution of science communication paradigms and concludes by proposing a "guide and co-create" paradigm as a potential template for a contemporary mode of science communication. While I applaud the author's broad view of the field, the article lacks some nuances that prevent me from recommending publication at this time. I have included more specific comments below (ordered by section) and I hope these are helpful for revision.

2. Make and Sell Communications

There is a bit of a straw-man argument in this section; that academics design their research "inside out." This is not necessarily the case and more nuance is warranted. Many researchers are driven by questions that are salient in society and this characterization of research as being driven from the inside out is not a fair treatment of the problem.

I would also argue that there are relatively few programs within universities that teach scientists media practices. Perhaps some examples might be warranted or some context provided (e.g., is this prevalent in the UK or Europe vs. US?).

3. Sense and Respond Communications

Science communication and science journalism are generally not considered one and the same. Please clarify what you are referring to when you reference the "long-standing tenets of science journalism."

Note that there is a page number missing on line 154.

4. Guide and Co-create Communications

This is a relatively short section, despite being the recommendation of the article. There is also relatively little treatment of the goals of communication in this article.

Although I agree that much early science communication was simply to share knowledge with external audiences, the paradigms described are warranted, depending on the goals of the communication. It is likely not simply shifting to a "guide and co-create" paradigm, but one that utilized the available tools, tactics, and strategies to accomplish the goals of science communication.

Technical Notes

In reviewing this article, I used the reverse outlining strategy. In doing so, I found the main points to be obscured in the relatively long paragraphs. I hope the author will consider revising the article such that shorter paragraphs are led by topic sentences (i.e., the main points), with supporting material contained within that paragraph.