

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2022-2-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on gc-2022-2

Sam Illingworth (Referee)

Referee comment on "The imaginary eruption – volcanic activity through kids' eyes" by Micol Todesco et al., Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2022-2-RC2>, 2022

This is a fascinating and extremely well structured paper that investigates how to explore issues of volcanic risk with a school age audience in a manner that is both dialogic and actionable. The methods are mostly suitable and easy to follow, and the findings and discussion all follow on logically from the results. I think that this would be a valuable contribution to the field of geoscience communication, and so I would definitely recommend it for publication. However, before doing so there are several issues that need to be addressed:

- The abstract is on the whole excellent. However, please consider the overuse of the word 'interesting' which appears quite a lot over the course of only a few sentences.
- The biggest issue that needs to be addressed with this study is one of ethics. What ethical clearance did this study receive? How did the participants give their informed consent to participate in this study (this is especially important as they are a potentially vulnerable audience)? What safeguarding and other issues arose? And how were these mitigated by the research team. See Section 4.1 of Archer (2021) or Section 2.2 of Mohadjer (2021) for examples of how you might best include this in your manuscript.
- It was not entirely clear how you moved from the frequency of words (Section 4.1) to the framing of these occurrences (Section 4.2). Could you please include more detail about how this was done and what method was adopted, as at the moment it would be difficult for an independent researcher to repeat your findings, or even for a new researcher to adopt this work for their own study.
- I wonder if Section 4.3 on Stromboli could be removed entirely, as it does not add anything significantly to the study, and as you point out yourselves is much less developed than the work in the other 10 school districts.
- The Conclusions are overly long and could benefit from both a streamlining and also a reframing around recommendations and/or advise for others wanting to adapt / build on this approach
- For the most part this is a very well-written proposal, but there are several technical corrections that need to be addressed. I picked up all the same ones as Reviewer 1, and so will not repeat them here. A final close proofread and edit after all these changes have been made would also be appreciated.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this work. I hope that this critique has been helpful, and I look forward to reading your responses.

Sam

References

Archer, M. O.: Schools of all backgrounds can do physics research – on the accessibility and equity of the Physics Research in School Environments (PRiSE) approach to independent research projects, *Geosci. Commun.*, 4, 189–208, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-4-189-2021>, 2021.

Mohadjer, S., Mutz, S. G., Kemp, M., Gill, S. J., Ischuk, A., and Ehlers, T. A.: Using paired teaching for earthquake education in schools, *Geosci. Commun.*, 4, 281–295, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-4-281-2021>, 2021.