

Hist. Geo Space. Sci. Discuss., author comment AC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/hgss-2021-20-AC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC2

Lif Lund Jacobsen

Author comment on "Intellectually gifted but inherently fragile – society's view of female scientists as experienced by seismologist Inge Lehmann up to 1930" by Lif Lund Jacobsen, Hist. Geo Space. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hgss-2021-20-AC2>, 2022

Q2: Does the paper present new historic research, new interpretations or new compilations

RC2: Yes, although it remains unclear what new results are presented in contrast to Jacobsen (2015). However, since Jacobsen (2015) was published in Danish, this article in English can reach a broader and more international audience.

Reply: The introduction now specifies what new data are included and how it affects the conclusion compared to Jacobsen (2015).

Q4: Do the authors give proper credit to related and previous work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?

RC2: Yes. I would recommend to make a clearer statement about which new sources are presented and in what way the argument is original.

Reply: Agreed. See reply to Q2.

Q6: Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

RC2: The abstract does not contain the research question. It would be helpful to include the research question (or argument) and the method/sources that are used to answer it.

Reply: The reviewers have an excellent point and I have amended the abstract accordingly.

Q9: Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?

IRC2: I suggest some more clarification regarding the following issues: In order to contextualize, I would recommend to include some more information about how Lehmann's case is not only representative for other women but also how representative it was for Denmark/Danish female scholars (within and beyond the university, and in a more contextualized form than the otherwise still helpful table 1). The originality of the paper could be made stronger by clarifying the questions: Why is this new material really important? Does it tell a new story or does it make a known story more nuanced? Also, including some Gender Studies literature (in addition to Rossiter) and referring to the current topics in Gender Studies might help to justify the relevance of Lehmann's case

beyond “just adding another story” of a woman in science.

Reply: I have rewritten the introduction and added to the discussion to show why Inge Lehmann’s story is relevant to history of science and to the discussion of women in STEM. See also my reply to RC2.

Given the profile of HGSS I think a larger discussion of Gender Studies literature and modern perspectives on women in STEM is better published elsewhere. But the reviewer’s point is well taken, and it is a topic I plan to explore further in another publication.