

Interactive comment on “Interdisciplinary Pressure Cooker: environmental risk communication skills for the next generation” by Lydia Cumiskey et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 30 July 2019

This paper tries to capture observations and lessons from a complex approach to enabling cross-disciplinary working. Although the premise of the paper is good the methods are a little vague and the analysis and results presented are not as robust as I would have expected. Overall, I believe that with some rewriting this could be a valid contribution to the journal however there are some issues that need to be addressed first:

Ethics: Despite this being research that involves human participants, and puts them under stress during a 19hr workshop, there is no mention of ethical clearance – should be in the acknowledgements at the very least. In addition there are moments in the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



paper where it would be very easy to work out who the participants are e.g. page 8 line 21 and are the photos relevant or do they add value to the paper?

Consistency: There is a lack of consistency throughout the paper in regards to some key terms. Given that language is one of the critical barriers for interdisciplinary multi-actor working this must be addressed. Capitals are used then not used e.g. the term pressure cooker is presented in various forms, with capitals, without, with quotation marks and without (see page 2 line 31).

Young professionals: The paper explains that an aim is to bring young professionals together, but there is no definition of what this means. This is particularly problematic on page 4 lines 10-16 where the criteria for participant selection has no relevance to being a 'young professional'. It is unclear why this selection criteria has been identified e.g. page 4 line 11 – why motivation? Why a representation of funders? How are they scored? Why are they scored? Why now is there a geographical element? What has any of this got to do with young professionals?

You use the term applicants? But this is also not explained, why are they applicants? Did you have funding available to them to attend? Why not keep consistency are call them participants?

WhatsApp? The remote participants were mentioned in section 3 but then this was not reflected on in the analysis. Did the remote participation have no impact on how the workshop ran? How did these participants perceive their involvement? Can you analysis the results to demonstrate the difference between these remote participants and in-person participants? Multiple terms for different or the same actors – it is not clear

Within the paper the authors discuss the following actors but without definitions or clarity on their roles, I believe sometimes these terms are used interchangeably:

- Applicants, participants, young professionals, researchers, mentors, specialists, ex-

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

perts, steering committee, case study specialists, experienced professional, early career researchers...etc. - Who and why is someone a specialist or an expert and someone not?

'Real world' – please define what you mean by this?

Resources provided to the participants appear very UK focused was there a reason for this? Did it have an influence in the results? English language is mentioned but not in the analysis or discussion.

Ice breaker event review: What was the purpose of observing the participants during the ice breaker session? It is not clear? Did the participants develop or just demonstrate a shared understanding of risk communication – this brief analysis and conclusion of the ice breaker event seems flippant and adds little value to the rest of the paper. Influence of the intense environment

There is no mention of the 19hrs of intensive work on the results of the workshop. I would have thought that this would have been discussed in the results analysis. After all this is an analysis of the pressure cooker method – yet no mention of whether this was ethical, exhausting for participants, that their judgement was impaired. ...any negative side effects at all!!!! E.g. page 9 lines 19 and 20. ...a lack of outputs not only a time issue but perhaps a tiredness issue? Lack of motivation?

Analysis I have already mentioned some areas of improvement for the analysis sections. However overall I don't believe the method of analysis is described in enough detail. How were the observations recorded? What was the data? How was the data analysed? Who did that work? What was their positionality?

In addition there is no mention of the influence of the context of the UNISDR Global Platform on participants and how they engaged? This should be included – was it mid platform, before or after this would have an influence on participant's motivations and knowledge.

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

Clumsy or wordy sentences which were difficult to understand: - Page 2 line 10. - Page 4 line 28 Confusing terms: - Page 3 line 22 A good problem. ...what is a good problem?? - Page 8 Line 16 placing the target audience – people – at the centre. ...No need to highlight the audience as ‘people’, unless there was a specific and relevant group of people under focus? - Page 8 line 4 risk communication/ interdisciplinary work. . .not / but ‘and’ - Page 8 natural/engineering. ...as above, use ‘and’ Typos/spellings and mistakes: - Citations do not require detailed explanations within the brackets, remove these e.g. page 3 line 22 & page 3 line 31 and 32. Page 2: - Line 15 – faced not facing - Line 20 missing ‘to’ between potential and engage - Line 21 missing brackets after - flood data - Line 29 NERC should have UK before full name, so that international readers understand it is the UK research council - Line 30 NASA expand for constancy with other acronyms Page 3: - Line 10 is shared features?? - Line 30 US CDC? Page 4: - Line 4 include the word ‘The’ in subtitle and keep subtitles consistent in terms of using or not using capitals for each word. - Line 17 do not start a sentence with a number Page 5: - Line 7 CDMX?

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2019-9>, 2019.

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