

Interactive comment on “Rapid collaborative knowledge building via Twitter after significant geohazard events” by Robin Lacassin et al.

Christopher Jackson (Referee)

c.jackson@imperial.ac.uk

Received and published: 28 November 2019

Dear Editor/Authors,

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to review Lacassin et al. I read this contribution with great interest, given my Twitter usage, as well as my personal research experience with some of the geohazards discussed in the manuscript. The manuscript highlights the key role that social media platforms, like Twitter, can play in challenging the conventional view of how, by who, and over what timeframe science is conducted. Note that I have made numerous annotations on a scanned hardcopy of the manuscript, many of which relate to typographical or grammatical issues, or suggestions that may help make the text clearer. I here provide some more specific comments, broadly tied to line

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



numbers, which the authors may wish to consider:

L88 - Could you perhaps provide an example or two of where this approach has been successfully used in another field? This type of analysis will be new to most (it certainly was to me). Note that your example need not be a STEM discipline.

L105 - How were the "most informative tweets" chosen? This sounds rather arbitrary, and my concern would be that such a subjective approach may, as the authors later go on to discuss, could exclude certain voices. Indeed, if voices are excluded, what impact might that have on the quality and robustness of the derived science? I think this needs discussing more; i.e. who is "in" and who is "out" when compiling your underlying data...

L111 and L128 - I strongly suggest you post all data underpinning your analysis on something like FigShare (<https://figshare.com/>). The data do not appear confidential, plus something like FigShare is a longer-lasting archive than someones hard-drive. Plus people do not live forever...

L148 - There seems to be some switching between passive and active voice. I would stick to one...preferably the latter...

L197 - "...as good a way..." compared to what?

L208 - As written, this makes it sound like Twitter is not a social media platform. I would perhaps rephrase this sentence.

L222 - I would rephrase this sentence, as I am not sure "critical explanation" makes sense here in this context.

L240 - See comment related to L105.

L298 - See comment related to L105.

L299 - How do you define a "reputable academic institution" or "credible scientist" (L301)? My concern here is that such definitions are rather poorly defined, and could

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



potential lead to the exclusion of particular voices not known by the 'in-crowd' who are driving the scientific discussion. Now, I am not accusing you of this, but I think this manuscript would be a good place to explore this problematic issue.

L312 - Please cite the "early publication" mentioned here, otherwise this comments sounds too anecdotal (when it need not).

L314 - What precisely do you mean by "some caution"? More specifically, what guidance would you provide people regarding their engagement with scientific discussions on Twitter? I know such guidelines might be hard to define, but some comments here would be useful.

L326 - What are "validated language elements"?

L365 - I remove "rigorous" from here, given this is not always the case. In fact, this is something you yourselves go on to say...

L375 - Twitter-based discussions and data generation may potential offer a route for the scientific community to better value the data itself. Too often we are concerned with the paper narrative, and not the fundamental quality and quantity of the data underpinning it.

L386 - What is the difference between "issued" and "released"?

L438 - Although 'science in the open' could be risky for the reason you state, I see absolutely nothing good coming from the opposite; i.e. 'closed science', in which the process and critique of science is done behind closed-doors, potentially by people with vested interests and/or conflicts-of-interest.

I really enjoyed reading this paper; it will make an excellent contribution to Geoscience Communication. I hope my comments are useful; if any of them are unclear, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks,

Chris Jackson

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.geosci-commun-discuss.net/gc-2019-23/gc-2019-23-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2019-23>, 2019.

GCD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

