

## **Gc-2020-20 DECISION**

The article is too theoretical and not easy to follow for those not in the field, and we are in a journal of Geoscience communication, where the potential readers are mainly unfamiliar with cognitive psychology. Following Referee 1 (Sara J ElShafie ), I believe the article would benefit by using actual narratives throughout to illustrate the author's points, even not in a ludic way, but simply to give examples. This has not been accomplished yet. While I believe it has been a good choice to introduce narrative earlier in the paper, at the same time incorporating discussion of how memory and narrative interplay through the manuscript does not help the inexperienced reader. The reader not in the field risk losing the overview. So I suggest, to give a summary on how narrative and memory interplay and how this can help science communication, at the end of the article before the final discussion or in the final discussion itself.

I also believe it would be advisable as suggested by Referee 1 elaborating on the role of story in geoscience knowledge across different cultures and offering some specific examples. Or at least make more references to “geo-stories”.

All in all, even if in par.2 the author indicates that the objective of his work is to provide a literary review of memory regarding memorability of narratives, the review results too long. In accordance with Referee 1 I must remark that the paper still contains very little on narrative. I believe that using examples of narrative will help the author and the reader to share the content of the article. In other words, the author should use narrative to accomplish what it is discussed in the paper itself: communicating in an efficacious way through narrative.

Always in par. 2 the author refers to previous articles where he provided empirical evidence suggesting that narratives represent a memorable text format. Even if the interested reader can read these articles, I believe that making explicit reference to some empirical evidence would make this article more accessible to a wider audience.

Specific suggestions related to the present decision have been annotated in the last draft of the paper.