

Interactive comment on “Assessing public outreach strategies in cities coping with climate risks” by Rosa Vicari et al.

Rosa Vicari et al.

rosa.vicari@enpc.fr

Received and published: 20 June 2018

The authors would like to thank Referee 2 for reviewing the manuscript and for providing the authors with his constructive remarks and recommendations. We have considered all issues raised in his critique and we believe that our manuscript will be improved after addressing these valuable comments. Here is a list of our preliminary responses to his comments and we hope that these changes will satisfy his requirements:

1)

"This manuscript set out to assess how science communication can contribute to urban resilience, using empirical studies to demonstrate how communication can increase scientific impact on resilience according to one or more resilience assessment frame-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



works. This is promising goal, and a potentially important contribution to the scholarship; enriching these frameworks with a more carefully consideration for communication. But, excepting a short discussion in the conclusion, unfortunately the manuscript fails to properly establish this link. It loses its way, its significance, and the reader. In my opinion this paper could be publishable subject to major revisions around its original purpose."

We are happy to see the Reviewer interest for the purpose of this research. We think that the paper establishes a link between resilient metrics and communication impact assessment, but it could be made more explicit in the Introduction, in Section 4 and in the Conclusions.

2)

"There are two words here that jar with science communication scholarship. 'Progress' to resilience is sticky: when resilience is a moving target, progress is too. 'Objectively' is similarly sticky. Given communication is often a two-way communication, the communicator is actively embedded in the communication act, and it is then difficult for them to objectively 'step outside' of this communication. Suffice to assess, without emphasising the objectivity."

As highlighted by the Reviewer, the word "objectively" could be removed from the Abstract as it is controversial. We also understand his concern with the word "progress", but in our view it is necessary and consistent with the intent of moving from a theoretical to a practical approach to social-ecological resilience. In our view adaptability and transformability are two essential characteristics of a resilient system. However, once it is clear what is the system and what is the disturbance we are interested in, it is possible to establish resilience metrics and compare the corresponding variables in different systems (e.g. different cities) or in the same system in two different moments.

3)

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

"The introduction...is not an introduction. It does not introduce the work that will be done in the paper, including a clear statement of the research question or aim. This material can be moved to the background Section 2."

We agree with the Reviewer that the Introduction would benefit of a presentation of the rationale, the purpose of this research, and the research questions. As suggested by the Reviewer, some information that is currently in the Introduction can be moved to Section 2.

4)

"Section 2: interesting, but there is no mention of science communication. The focus is on resilience assessment metrics alone. I missed some up-front reflections on all of the unquantifiable elements of resilience. This kind of quantitative work seems, to me, to draw a very narrow concept of resilience. Section 3 is unnecessarily long and doesn't contribute much to this papers discussion. It is enough to note that there are many different frameworks available, and which frameworks this manuscript focussed to evaluate the impact of science communication. It could be shortened and combined with Section 2."

We also agree with the reviewer that sections 2 and 3 could be improved by making more explicit the link with science communication. However, in our opinion, it is important to keep the focus on quantitative assessment, since it facilitates an analysis of the interactions between the socio-economic factors, such as communication, and the physical-environmental factors. In our view, qualitative assessments give valuable insights on resilience but, for the purposes of this research, we prefer to employ it to validate the results based on quantitative assessments.

5)

"Section 4 is interesting for this paper; to me it is the core. It should provide more detail on the mechanisms between communication and resilience, to help us better under-

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

stand the assessment in terms of influence, rather than as bald measurements that reveal no clear causal link between the communication and resilience. I expected to see how communication assessment linked to the metrics of one or more resilience assessment frameworks, but it was missing. Some of the reflections from the conclusion could be moved up here."

We understand the Reviewer concern with Section 4: we plan to strengthen the links with the other sections and develop the reflection on how communication impacts on resilience with concrete examples from Paris Region. We will also include a paragraph with a list of guiding criteria to assess the impact of communication on resilience. This list was outlined on the base of the review of resilience assessment frameworks in Section 3.

6)

"Section 5 does not add much. It should be linked to the manuscripts core work, or removed."

We agree with the Reviewer that the link between Section 5 and the core of the manuscript should be made more explicit.

7)

"Section 6 fails to make any link to resilience assessment metrics. It reads independent to the rest of the paper, as an account of three different communication assessment approaches for a resilience project. I could see how this communication assessment contributed to resilience as framed in a resilience assessment framework. To the three methods, the quantitative work I understood, apart from Figure 3. Of course its limited in what it shows, but the authors admit that. The qualitative assessment is more problematic, as presented now. These kinds of 'science comprehension tests' have been around a long time in the communication scholarship, but there was no reflection here on the multiple problems with this approach."

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Thank you for your suggestions concerning Section 6:

- As regards the need to strengthen the link with Section 3, we believe that the list of guiding criteria that will be included in Section 4 will also strengthen Section 6;

- As regards Figure 3, we will review the legend so that the comprehension is more immediate;

- As regards the survey, we will develop the reflection on the constraints related to this method, especially in the operational context of a communication campaign.

8)

"For me, the most interesting approach was the interviews, which provides the space for target audiences to explain what they understood, how it could help them or not, and yes, any contributions to resilience as defined in resilience assessment frameworks. This seems, to me, to be the best method for linking communication assessment to resilience assessment."

As for the Conclusions, we believe that these different methods are complementary and an assessment aimed to understand the impact of communication on resilience cannot rely on only one technique. We are also convinced that implementing advanced text mining and network representation of web communication contents in this field will innovate communication quality assessment. These techniques will be the object of our future research.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2018-4>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

