This is a timely paper that presents some interesting findings on the agents involved in an important environmental science debate and the influence this plays on the nature of the media coverage. The conclusions presented at the end of the paper are supported by the data presented. However, conclusions would also be strengthened further by contrasting them with findings from the other literature that considers the role of science PR.

The social relevance of the study, of the need for actors from scientific groups to be part of science-related debates such as CCS, is presented convincingly in the introduction and this provides a firm basis for the study. However, there is a lack of clarity in some aspects of the introduction and in places assumptions are made that are not evidenced.

P4 (line 18) it states that scientific institutions do not include communication departments that follow equally high professional standards. What is meant by professional standards in this context needs to be defined as well as this claim being evidenced. As reported by Murcott and Williams (2012), numerous studies have noted the rise of science PR in universities, among other places, in recent years as well as the growth in effectiveness of these press offices at influencing media coverage. This is important context to the study.

P5 (lines 23 onwards) – how science communication is being defined is not clear. Journalistic representations of science are contrasted with the 'emotionless communication' behaviour of science. But where does this communication of science that's emotionless appear? And is journalism itself not part of science communication?

P6 (line 5) The material provided by science PR – focused on risks and benefits and demands and expectations – is contrasted with what recipients expect; factual and research based information. However, the preference for this material among audiences is not evidenced.

The analysis design is clearly explained and is robust, drawing on a commendable number of newspaper articles. However, the rationale behind using a quasi-week sum to reduce the number of articles could be clearer in terms of why it was important to eliminate single events; what are single events in this context and why were they irrelevant?

P9 – first paragraph, CCS is referred to as a scientific topic. However, what a scientific topic is and how that can be justified in relation to CSS is not clearly argued. While the legitimacy of analysing the actors present in media coverage and the influence of this on the nature of coverage cannot be questioned, the apparent claim to ownership of the topic by the scientific discipline can. So some justification is required for this.

P11 – The findings relating to the influence of the actors present in a story on whether CCS is framed negatively or positively are interesting.

P12 – (line 20) – The weakness of science PR in relation to other social systems is not a widely-held perspective in the literature. As stated above Murcott and Williams (2012) note the rise of science PR. The relative strength of science PR may be different in different countries. Studies noting the rise of science PR are worth reflecting upon in this paper. In anything, the contrast between the oft-reported rise of science PR and the findings here of the lack of a role for science in the CCS debate makes the findings more interesting.

P13 (line 19) 'failed conversation between researchers and scientists' – should this be journalists and scientists?

Finally the conclusion rightly mentions the frames used in the presentation of CCS in the media. Given the nature of the analysis conducted here, the paper would be strengthened by an earlier definition of framing theory and use of this during the analysis and results in addition to the use in the conclusion.

Murcott, T., Williams, A. (2012). The Challenges for Science Journalism in the UK. *Progress in Physical Geography*. 37 (2), pp. 152-160.