

Interactive comment on “Graphic design and scientific research: the INGV experience” by Daniela Riposati et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 26 May 2020

I read this paper with interest, as I consider the developments it describes really important for effective communication in science. I have no doubt that the paper and its beautiful iconography will definitely be of inspiration for many.

Unfortunately, the quality of the text does not match the value of the work presented. I see three main limitations.

First of all, the introductory parts do not explain clearly what the reader will find in the text. The paper is interesting and rich, but the experiences it describes appear one on top of the other without any prior guidance. The authors would have gotten much better recognition for their work if they identified and clearly listed in some orderly fashion the different areas of their activity: corporate, large project, participation to meetings, edu-games etc.

C1

The second major obstacle is the English, that is poor and definitely needs a thorough review by a professional translator.

Due to the poor quality of the translation, the logic implied in some statements is sometimes flawed, and this is a further limitation. This implies that the translator must be carefully followed to make sure that he/she understands exactly what the authors meant to say.

I truly hope that the authors will do their best to improve the text to a reasonable publication standard. As I already stated, the quality of the illustrations is very good, and the display of the Laboratorio's past activity really outstanding. Some of the drawings are truly awesome small pieces of art (e.g. that of the Tsumaps-NEAM project) that make some logos of just a few decades ago appear as pre-history.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-17>, 2020.

C2