

***Interactive comment on* “Communicating Complex Forecasts for Enhanced Early Warning in Nepal” by Mirianna Budimir et al.**

Mathew Stiller-Reeve

mast@norceresearch.no

Received and published: 10 April 2019

During the short course “How to Peer Review” at EGU2019, we used a peer-review framework to review your abstract. The roughly 60 (mostly) early career researchers at the course reviewed your abstract in groups of 2-3. We then had an open discussion and noted down all the feedback. They reviewed your abstract using a structured worksheet and the following advice in mind: “The abstract is a condensed and concentrated version of the full text of the research manuscript. It should be sufficiently representative of the paper if read as a stand-alone document”. We hope the following is helpful for your revisions.

Title: The title is brief and succinct, but several delegates felt it did not reflect what the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



abstract conveyed as the main objective; the main objective seemed to be to review current forecasting systems in Nepal. In this way, the word “communicating” in the title is misleading. Others suggested that it would be useful if the title indicated what type of warning the paper is considering. Is it weather related for example?

Need and relevance: The group thought that the relevance was clear, however there was a general feeling that this part of the abstract was too long. The authors spend too much time talking about early warning systems. If the paper is about complex systems then this should have more space. What are the barriers and challenges that are mentioned? At least one example would be nice.

Hypothesis/Objectives: It seems like the paper is about the benefits of complex systems over simple systems. However, the authors review the systems that already exist. This review is actually the main objective of the paper and needs to be clearer. If the hypothesis is made clearer in the abstract, then it will also be easier to link it more concretely to the title.

Methods: The authors explain why they need this review but lack details about what they do. What does “review” and “analyse” actually mean in this case? The authors also measure impacts, but what type of impacts are they referring to? Also in this part of the abstract the authors use parentheses, which the delegates felt unnecessary.

Results/conclusions: Some indication of the results and conclusions are lacking at present. We recommend that the authors include something about this to entice the reader onwards. Some delegates would also have liked to see a short commentary of future research, but more importantly a strong take-home message at the end.

Writing: In general the writing is good, and kudos for using the semi-colon correctly. However, several delegates commented on the long sentences that should be reduced and the extensive use of the passive voice. The example of “research was undertaken” was brought up. Also unless you have someone called “Research” in your team, you should avoid writing “research reviewed”. As the recommendations for abstracts in

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

Geoscience Communication state, you should also avoid using acronyms. You use “DHM” here and never refer to it again. That’s a sure sign that you don’t need it in the abstract. The delegates thought “SMS” was ok to use as it is so embedded in modern culture. The authors also use some heavy words like “utilize” which they can simplify with “use”. This is much more accessible.

All in all, this is a nice abstract, but some of the elements need to be cut down and focused in order to leave space for other important aspects like results, conclusion and a take home message.

Mathew Stiller-Reeve, Bronwyn Wake and the EGU delegates at the short course “how to peer-review”.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2019-3>, 2019.

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