

Hist. Geo Space. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/hgss-2021-20-RC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on hgss-2021-20

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee 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-RC2>, 2021

1.) Yes.

2.) 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.

3.) Yes.

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

5.) Yes.

6.) 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.

7.) Yes.

8.) Yes.

9.) The article is well written, in a clear language, and shows a reasonable structure. Although the narrative remains descriptive over most of the main part the story is interesting and relevant. 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). This would be helpful for readers who are not familiar with Danish social history.

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? The result (Lehmann's career was typical for a female academic) is not surprising and doesn't seem very original at first sight. But maybe Lehmann's case is indeed more interesting than other cases of female academics in other scientific disciplines? The argument that Lehmann succeeded only because seismology was new and less prestigious sounds plausible and really interesting. As a suggestion, this argument could be stronger, more prominent and more elaborated in order to emphasize the relevance and uniqueness of the case.

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. But also without this specific addition, I think it is an interesting paper worth to be published with minor revisions.