

## ***Interactive comment on “Boundary|Time|Surface: Art and geology meet in Gros Morne National Park, Newfoundland, Canada” by Sydney A. Lancaster and John W. F. Waldron***

**Sydney A. Lancaster and John W. F. Waldron**

sydney.lancaster@gmail.com

Received and published: 1 May 2020

Thank you for your helpful comments regarding the abstract. We suggest some revisions we might make below.

Title: The title matches the abstract, but not necessarily the objective of the study, which we did not manage to grasp.

Response: We suggest the modifying the title to make the objective clearer: “Boundary|Time|Surface: Assessing the public response to a geologically themed art project in Gros Morne National Park, Canada”

C1

It’s a clear title, but we wondered if the location needs to be mentioned. Why not simply write “geological boundary”? Also, if you include the location in the title, then this should match how you describe the location in the Abstract itself. At the moment, they do not seem to match, which makes it difficult for readers not familiar with these places.

Response: In the regional geology literature, it is usual that editors require some definition of the location in the title. Also, the art is a site-specific installation; we therefore feel mention of the location is appropriate to the title, but will shorten it and edit the abstract so that the location descriptions in the title and the abstract match.

Need and relevance: We failed to clearly identify what the need or relevance of this work from the Abstract. If it is to “interrogate the human practice of dividing the Earth for social, political, scientific and aesthetic reasons” then could you add a short sentence to explain why.

Response: We will add sentences to the first paragraph: “One such practice is the subdivision of geologic time. We assess the role of this site-specific art installation and its documentation in drawing the attention of a broader public to a boundary of importance in this endeavour.” We will also edit the second and third paragraphs (see below) to bring our their relationship to need and relevance, which were insufficiently clear.

We also didn’t quite understand what these “social, political, scientific and aesthetic reasons” might be.

Response: We do feel that this summary should be ok, as fully defining these common fields of inquiry would require far more space than an abstract.

We have a feeling that the second and third paragraphs on touching the relevance of the project, but the ideas need to be drawn together. . . .

Response: We hope that the added sentences will clarify this relevance.

C2

Hypothesis/Objectives: This is where we had difficulty. We can't see any research objectives, questions or hypotheses. If the aim is to interrogate human practice, then what is the question related to that and how does one evaluate it?

Response: The added sentence in the first paragraph beginning "We assess..." will now address this.

Methods: The method was not clear... to be a full story about research.

Response: We will add a clear statement of the methods at the end of the first paragraph: "It was brought to the public through exhibitions, public talks, and a book. To evaluate the success of this project, we examine the public responses to these activities through attendance records and written visitor comments."

Results and conclusion: ... results of the research process need to explain the results related to the research question itself and the evaluation that's been carried out. Take home message: A take-home message will ideally mention how the research contributes to a wider perspective...

Response: Thank you for pointing out these omissions; this is covered in the paper but was inadequately represented in the abstract. We will add a paragraph summarizing the outcomes and take-home message along the following lines: Questions at 11 public presentations indicated a high level of engagement from both artists and scientists. Of several thousand visitors to exhibitions, 418 written comments reflected the viewers' engagement with both Green Point and the underlying concepts. Both the original installation and the subsequent work allowed audiences to explore the ways in which humans understand and acquire knowledge about the Earth, and how world-views inform the process of scientific inquiry.

Clarity and conciseness: The abstract is mostly easy to understand. The authors should consider reformulating the second sentence of the second paragraph which is particularly difficult to follow. And maybe the authors would consider splitting or editing

C3

some of the longer sentences to shorter forms.

Response: We will combine the second and third paragraphs, shortening some of the sentences, and re-wording so as to highlight the need and relevance of combining artistic and scientific approaches to the Earth. Our draft reads as follows: "Geologists and artists have taken different approaches in documenting features of the Earth, and have communicated these approaches to largely different segments of the population. Geology has as its basis the establishment of limits and boundaries within the Earth. Pioneers of geology defined the periods of the geologic timescale with the intent of representing natural chapters in Earth history; from their colonialist perspective, it was anticipated that these would have global application. Since the mid-20th century, stratigraphers have attempted to resolve the resulting gaps and overlaps by establishing international stratotypes. Artists creating work in dialogue with the land and environment have taken a range of approaches, from major, permanent interventions to extremely ephemeral activities, some of which echo practices in geological fieldwork. Boundary|Time|Surface attempted to bring a combination of scientific and artistic discourse to a larger public. The installation was constructed by hand in one day, on the falling tide from materials found on site, in order to have minimal environmental impact. During the remainder of the tidal cycle, and those following, the fence was dismantled by wave and tidal action. This cycle of construction and destruction was documented in video and with time-lapse still photography."

Our main issue concerns the flow in the abstract... In this way the abstract should mirror your paper and include all the important elements that your paper likely already contains.

Response: With the modifications described above, the flow of the abstract now closely follows that of the paper.

... Overall this seems like a very nice story about geoscience communication, and we hope that you can add the needed information to make it a nice story about research

C4

into geoscience communication.

Response: We thank the reviewers for their comments and hope that the modifications have addressed their questions.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-2>, 2020.