

Interactive comment on “Building bridges between experts and the public: a comparison of two-way communication formats for flooding and air pollution risk” by Maria Loroño-Leturiondo et al.

Maria Loroño-Leturiondo et al.

maria.lorono@stu.mmu.ac.uk

Received and published: 14 August 2018

Thank you for the time you have taken in reviewing this manuscript, the helpful comments that you have provided, and for stating that our argument is clear. Your comments suggest that the manuscript should be (1) more carefully edited to avoid typos and misplaced commas, and (2) that some sentences need rewriting so that our argument becomes more coherent.

We acknowledge that there are some typos that need editing and this has now been

C1

addressed. We have also paid special attention to the use of commas, and as a result we believe the readability of the manuscript has improved. We also agree that some sentences might be overcomplicated. We have reviewed the whole manuscript and rewritten the sentences that you have highlighted, in addition to other sentences that present the same issues.

For example, following your comment: Line 9-10 I do not know what the following sentence is trying to say: ‘These games tend to follow a downstream approach, although they allow two-way communication between experts and the public, the content of it is designed by the experts in order to fulfill an educational purpose.’

We have rewritten this sentence, which now reads:

"Although serious games allow two-way interactions between experts and non-experts, they tend to follow a top-down approach to communication. That is, the experts are in control of the communication process. Experts are behind the game design and decide what content and information is included which will, in turn, guide the concepts to be discussed and learned by the non-experts."

You also suggest the following edit: In line 5 delete ‘, thus,’

Our sentence reads:

"Although serious games can be a vehicle for learning and communication in themselves (Felicio et al., 2014), they are sometimes accompanied by discussion and debate. It is, thus, common that serious games are played in classroom settings, where the teacher guides debate, answers questions, and explains concepts (Rodriguez Bermúdez et al., 2015)."

“Thus” here refers to: because serious games are accompanied by discussion and debate, it is common that they are played in classroom settings. Without the “thus” it is a disconnected sentence. We have however taken your suggestion on board and modified this sentence to delete “thus”. It now reads:

C2

"Although serious games can be a vehicle for learning and communicating in themselves (Felicio et al., 2014), they are sometimes accompanied by discussion and debate and played in classroom settings, where the teacher guides debate, answers questions, and explains concepts (Rodriguez Bermúdez et al., 2015)."

For that same fragment you suggest the following change:

Line 5 replace 'sometimes' with 'better when'.

This sentence is taken from the results section. What we suggest is descriptive; based on the articles we have analysed, serious games are sometimes accompanied with debate (not always, as they can be a tool for learning in themselves). You suggest introducing a value judgement – "it is better"– which we believe should be left for the discussion.

Some of your suggestions, however, seem to be subject to differences in writing styles rather than incorrect writing. For example, you suggest the following edit:

Page 11 line 4 replace 'communication' with 'communicating'. Our sentence reads:

"Although serious games can be a vehicle for learning and communication in themselves (Felicio et al., 2014), they are sometimes accompanied by discussion and debate."

We believe there is nothing wrong with the word "communication" in that sentence and suggesting the word "communicating" is just a matter of preference and writing style; to our ears, "vehicle for communication" sounds more satisfying than "vehicle for communicating".

These and other changes will be seen in the revised manuscript when this is submitted. We hope that you will agree that we have addressed your comments successfully.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2018-1>, 2018.