

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., author comment AC3  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-39-AC3>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Reply on RC2

Richard Westaway

---

Author comment on "GC Insights: Rainbow colour maps remain widely used in the geosciences" by Richard M. Westaway, Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-39-AC3>, 2021

---

I thank reviewer #2 for taking the time to review the manuscript and for raising some interesting points.

It was disappointing to read that the reviewer felt that the paper was not useful to the general reader, but without specific feedback on why they felt this was the case, it is hard for me to make any further comment. Discussion was deliberately not expanded to wider topics as (i) I felt these have been covered elsewhere and (ii) as a "GC Insights" paper, the manuscript was intended to concisely present an idea but not explore it in detail. Nonetheless, I will endeavour to add further references to the manuscript and/or make it clearer where further details can be obtained (e.g. Crameri et al 2020 for factors; Stoelzle and Stein 2021 for proposals).

I agree that lack of guidance remains an issue and that, historically at least, software and visualisation packages provided poor default colour options. However I think that situation has changed in recent years, with many packages now offering a much better range of colour map options (e.g. ColourBrewer <https://colorbrewer2.org/> and Scientific colour maps <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1243862>).

Finally, I agree that 'training' in scientific visualisation has not been (and is likely still not) as common or seen as important as training in other aspects of scientific communication, and that this is likely another reason for the persistence of rainbow and red-green colour schemes.