

## ***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.***

**v. Elverfeldt (Referee)**

kirsten.vonelfverfeldt@aau.at

Received and published: 4 December 2018

**Summary** The article compares different communication strategies between experts and the public for the cases of flooding and air pollution risk. Different communication format, i. e. social media, educational programmes, serious games, citizen science, and forums are systematically reviewed and analysed in terms of short-time and long-time effectiveness. The authors conclude that the different formats all have their advantages and drawbacks and should be used depending on the purpose and the people involved.

C1

Review summary 1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of GC? Yes. As is stated on the journal's webpage, "the purpose of this journal is to help share knowledge and give more "traditional" recognition to science communication in the geosciences". In particular, the journals subject areas of geoscience education, geoscience engagement, and open geoscience are addressed in this article. The paper also discusses (science) communication theory and incorporates aspects of social science. 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? The paper is a review paper with the purpose to compare the success/appropriateness of different communications strategies in the context of flooding and air pollution risk. To my knowledge, this has not been done before in this context and thus the article offers novel insights to the subject. 3. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Methods are very clearly outlined. The assumptions are to some extent rather implicit and could be made more explicit, but I think this is the case for most articles throughout all subject areas. 4. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? yes. 5. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? yes. 6. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? yes. However, in some instances I slightly disagree whether a given approach really is two-way and not one-way (see detailed review below) 7. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? yes. 8. Is the overall presentation well-structured and clear? yes. 9. Is the language fluent and precise? I'm a non-native, so I might be wrong, but I think that the English could be improved (commas and wording). Please see the second part of the detailed review ("minor points") 10. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? yes.

For detailed review see PDF.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.geosci-commun-discuss.net/gc-2018-1/gc-2018-1-RC3-supplement.pdf>

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

C2