

Interactive comment on “GAIA 5.0 – A five-dimensional geometry for the 3D visualization of Earth’ climate complexity” by Renate C.-Z.-Quehenberger et al.

Tiziana Lanza (Editor)

tiziana.lanza@ingv.it

Received and published: 22 February 2021

Dear All (reviewers and authors),

first of all, thank you very much for engaging in this complicated peer review. I am the editor handling this paper, and I feel I have also to intervene in the discussion, in the hope that the article will be finally shaped in the right way to be published.

1: I would like to remind once again Renate and co-authors to carefully read what M. Archer has also suggested: Illingworth+, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-1-1-2018>. This is extremely important.

C1

2: Motivation and target. I had the pleasure to visit the installation in two occasions: at the Joint Research Centre (in a scientific context) and at Bozar (artistic context). For this reason, I have asked Renate to clearly state what are the motivations behind this SciArt installation. As far as I have understood the authors would like to raise a debate inside the scientific community. Is this true? Can I ask the authors to clearly state their motivations behind this SciArt installation? Please think about it!

This should be clarified also when they write about the target. The main target is the scientific community? In this case, the present work can be an interesting example on how art can be used to raise a scientific debate. Then, there is another level through which, by the means of art the general public is introduced in what it is described in 94-100. The voice of Lydia Lunch, the creepy music instil in the visitors’ feelings of respect towards Gaia, the Mother Earth. Can you please let us know clearly what kind of message you intend to address to the general public?

3: please have in mind that the subject of the present article (to be included in the present Special Issue) is the SciArt installation, as I have told Renate several time. Please be sure that all the people that haven’t visited the installation can have at least an idea of it. How can you do this:

Describe early in the paper how this installation works clearly. Paragraph 2 (GAIA 5.0: The installation as it is shaped now doesn’t do it). Immediately put the link regarding the installation, the video supplement: <https://av.tib.eu/media/49792>. Make immediately reference to the text performed by Lydia Lunch. Include also and immediately the timeline of the video. Add further details as: what the visitor of the installation is supposed to do. Give also some details about the environment of the installation. Where the visitor is supposed to watch the video? In a TV screen? Projected in the wall... And the sound is loud? What is the role of the text performed by Lydia Lunch? Is the visitor supposed to pay attention to the words performed, or the performance of Lydia Lunch is just evocative?

C2

4: Since the text provided in the appendix immediately introduces the reader in the scientific debate raised, now it comes the time to dedicate a well shaped paragraph to the philosophical and scientific background of the SciArt installation. The paragraph can be built taking some key concepts in the text already provided in the appendix as: “infinite 5-dimensional space” “Pangaea the dreaming creature” the reinstated concept of “aether” “the new interpretation of the earth’ intrinsic dynamic relying on the geometry of space itself”, and so on. Please do it in plain language avoiding as much as possible jargon, as it is very well suggested by D.Pyle, but also by M.Archer, both declaring the article being impenetrable and cryptic.

5: How do you decide if your SciArt installation has accomplished what you intended to in conceiving it? There is no evaluation in the present paper but at least let us know about your future plans. Do you intend to reinstall it in other context? Are you planning to investigate the effects of the installation on the different kind of public? Do you intend to investigate the effects of your installation inside the scientific community? I believe this would be interesting. . .

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-27>, 2020.