

# ***Interactive comment on “Remember rhythm and rime: Memory and narratives in science communication” by Aquiles Negrete***

**Aquiles Negrete**

aqny@yahoo.co.uk

Received and published: 15 September 2020

Final response

Changes regarding Dr. Sara ElShafie comments:

1) Narrative is now introduced and defined earlier in the document. 2) Rhyme is the right word, thanks! 3) The abstract was modified according to your suggestions 4) Bartlett's experiment is now explained. 5) The citations that were missing are now included. 6) Paragraphs were organized according to your comments 7) “Models” is a section now on its own 8) The section “Narratives as mnemonic devices” was broken up and incorporated throughout the manuscript (this was the original arrangement but the previous referee suggested to change it and create the section “Narratives as

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



mnemonic devices”). 9) “Short-term” and “Long-term” were corrected. 10) For me the problem regarding British and American English is confusing, as I am not a native speaker. I normally use British corrector (because I did my PhD in Britain). For British English the corrector accepts both: “organization” and “organisation”. I checked the rest of the document with the British option and I changed the few spelling mistakes that the corrector marked as incorrect, but I am not sure if there are more mistakes. 11) The idea of introducing an interactive “exercise” to the reader is really interesting! However I did not write this paper with this idea in mind, I believe I will, no doubt, do this in the future but I need to create the paper right from the beginning with this intention in mind. Thanks again, it is a wonderful idea making the paper a ludic one! 12) My experience with figures has been rather difficult because most of those available in the internet have copyright and I currently do not have access (due to the quarantine) to a designer to create my own. General comments:

â&#x201c; The document is now reorganised in the following sections:

1. Abstract (there was no abstract in the previous version) 2. Introduction 3. Objective and methodology (this section did not exist in the previous version) 4. Literary review on memory studies (this section was shortened and refined) 5. Narratives as mnemonic devices for Science Communication (this is a new section required by the referees. It concentrates the view of the author about the importance of narrative mnemonic capabilities for science communication). 6. Final note 7. Bibliography

â&#x201c; Several technical words were defined, while others were omitted from the document in order to offer a better reading for non-specialists. â&#x201c; All the references related to brain structures were eliminated, they resulted too technical and unnecessary (therefore no brain diagram was needed). â&#x201c; I have corrected all the grammar and spelling mistakes marked by the referees â&#x201c; Missing bibliography was completed. â&#x201c; I revised the suggested literature and also included more recent quotes that I found on “Memory and Narratives” (Dr. Nancy Longnecker). I believe my paper looks much better now after reworking it with the referees’ changes. Finally I would like to thank for all

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

the comments and interest showed in the interactive discussion phase.

Dr. Aquiles Negrete Yankelevich

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-20>, 2020.

**GCD**

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

