

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 13 June 2018

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 frameworks. 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. More specifically: Abstract: 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 communica-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



tion 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.

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.

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.

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 understand 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.

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

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

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

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. 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.

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

GCD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

