

Interactive comment on “The Flat Earth satire, using science theatre to debunk absurd theories” by George Sand França et al.

Aleksander Väljamäe (Referee)

aleksander.valjamae@gmail.com

Received and published: 7 July 2020

The paper "The flat Earth satire..." touches an important topic of art-science interventions for fighting pseudoscientific beliefs. It has its potential but needs a major content revision, plus English language review. The main key points of improvement, if the paper will be re-submitted, are as follows: - It would be good to know about the previous art-science process in theatre and since the references are mainly in Portuguese, I would encourage authors to extend the highlights from these earlier studies. - Introduction should be made stronger addressing the available statistics on Modern flat-Earthers etc. - I would recommend to create a new section that is dedicated to the show creation, with more details to understand what it was. On line 90 authors write that it was evaluated weakly - how, by who, and for what? Descrip-

C1

tion of the presenter costume is detailed but how it is important? How the structure of the show was designed (e.g., mamulengos, different concepts) and whether there was some specific dramatically to it? - I would recommend a separate section on the questionnaire - why these particular questions were selected, what were the expectations/assumptions/hypotheses behind that? - Discussion needs some significant substance. Perhaps there were also some discussions with the audience, or semi-structured interviews. Any new performances planned? Recollections from the actors. Comments on the associated communication - posters, posts in social media. Again, possible reflections in press/social media? - It would be good if more reflections are provided on the collaborative process of the team (who was in the team) while creating the show. - Regarding the figures - I guess the original questions were in Brazilian. Please provide these as well, and check the translation - as it is now it is rather ambiguous. X-axis needs labels. Figure 3 is not really scientific - this percentage can be just mentioned in the text. Figure 4 - change the font, not easy to read now. Would be good to have the split between females and males (or age, education) for the statistics, if that was also collected. Would be nice to have more insights into Figure 6 - why these mixed responses - perhaps, if analyzed with the other data, it could be more informative (correlation between responses of previous knowledge or performance appreciation).

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-19>, 2020.

C2