Geosci. Commun. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-1-RC1, 2020

Geoscience Communication Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "SSFX (Space Sound Effects) Short Film Festival: Using the film festival model to inspire creative art-science and reach new audiences" *by* Martin O. Archer

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 25 March 2020

This paper describes the process of creation of a short film festival inspired by satellite recordings of perturbations of the magnetic field, converted into audio datasets. The paper is interesting to the broad field audience of Geoscience Communication. It is a revealing journey behind the scenes of producing a film festival. The project wisely followed the standard processes of international film festivals, which was important to call independent filmmakers' attention. The project target audiences were independent filmmakers, film programmers and exhibitors, and attendees of film festivals. The author provided some evidence that shows the project was a suitable method to infiltrate space science into culture. Although of good quality, the manuscript could be improved following small suggestions described below.

Suggestions and comments: 1) The introduction section could be improved. The topic introduction on the Abstract is better, in the way it presents the topic. Also, the objectives are not clearly set at the end of the introduction. On the contrary, in the conclusions section, the objectives and audiences became clear; I suggest that that phrasing could be followed at the beginning of the manuscript. 2) The numbers of film competition participants and film exhibitions are on their selves proofs that independent filmmakers, film programmers and exhibitors became, at least, aware of space weather. However, having assisted all films and the anthology, which was an enjoyable part of this paper revision, a question came across. Films are different in more than one way. There is not enough evidence to understand if the impacts of "Saturation" are similar to "Noise". In Table 1 it is not clear if audiences of shorts assisted all films. The anthology adds a message, that films independently exhibited (at least some) do not. This ambiguity can easily be solved adding information to Table 1. 3) I'm not sure the alpha coefficient of Krippendorff (2018) is a straightforward concept for Geoscience Communication audience. The editor can disregard this note if consider otherwise. 4) The gathering of data about impact on festival attendees could have gone further. On page 16, lines 384-385, it is not clear how the "ball in bin questions upon arrival assessing prior knowledge" was actually made. What were the questions? How was the content analysis of the grafitti wall made? The quotes on page 19 seem cherry picked, they do not configure a systematic qualitative assessment of impact. From the science communication research point of view, these methodologies are somewhat fragile. This may be also related to way the paper is structured. There is no traditional narrative introduction - methods - results, which is totally understandable given the type of work, but turn some analysis more difficult to follow. All this information can be added as Appendix. 5) Lines 320-338: the way quotes are presented, not formatted in a different way, hinder the reading. It is not obvious if different goers are being quoted or it is the same person. 6) There is an excess of grey literature in the reference section. Of course, this is an innovative work, which means there is not a solid literature body to build upon. Nevertheless, it is not the first publication about art inspired by science

envisioning science communication; an integrative discussion of this work in light of others would greatly improve the already interesting manuscript and place it within science & art and science communication state-of-the-art. 7) There are some typos that the author can check in a revised version. Not exhaustively: line 81 (amongst), line 74 (? missing), line 92 (specific), line 366 (infiltrating), Table 1 (* next to some numbers not led to a footnote).

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-1, 2020.