GCD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "Flash Flood! – A SeriousGeoGame combining science festivals, video games, and virtual reality with research data for communicating flood risk and geomorphology" *by* Chris Skinner

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 4 July 2019

This paper presents an intriguing idea around creating a visualization of a flood using VR to represent an often overlooked aspect of flood risk, to engage with participants of a science festival through encouraging their curiosity and sense of fun. It is a well written paper that describes the process of designing the game and testing it in a science festival scenario, however despite the interesting concept there are a couple of flaws I would like to see addressed before publication.

Firstly I think there is scope to improve the literature section, both in terms of quantity and source. Additionally I would like to see more description of how this simulation

operates as a game, as it appeared from the descriptions to be more of a visualization? It would be great to get more information here. The figures could do with a bit of refining (particularly the graphs) as although they presented interesting ideas I found them to be a bit confusing. In particular the presentation of the 'model' which I thought needs to be far clearer. With a little work, the visualization of a model would be really useful in this paper to help the reader understand the main premise.

My greatest concern, however, was with the evaluation. Although the author stated that science festivals are not conducive to evaluation, that is not actually the case if the appropriate evaluation method is chosen beforehand and designed carefully into the activity. For a really good example please see the works of Sardo and Grand (Science in Culture: Audiences Perspectives Engaging with Science at a Summer Festival, 2016 and What Works in the Field? Evaluating Informal Science Events, 2017).

Even if you wold prefer not to evaluate in a science festival, it is still possible to evaluate this game in other environments specifically designed for evaluation, which would provide a much more empirical as opposed to anecdotal data-set.

Having said that, I do think the idea and the effort that have gone into the game design are worthy of publication, but I think some more robust evaluation of the game needs to be done before that can happen. When that happens I look forward to reading the results!

I have included further comments in the supplement.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.geosci-commun-discuss.net/gc-2019-8/gc-2019-8-RC2-supplement.pdf

———————————————————

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2019-8, 2019.