

Interactive comment on ““Focus on glaciers””: a geo-photo exposition on the vanishing beauty” by Giuliana Rossi et al.

Giuliana Rossi et al.

grossi@inogs.it

Received and published: 17 June 2020

We kindly acknowledge the reviewer for his/her time, accurate reading, appreciation, and valuable comments that will be of help in improving our manuscript. In the following, we reply to his/her comments point by point (you find the same in the attached file).

1) Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of GC? Yes, this contribution fits with GC aims and scope, since the authors' wish have been the communication of a particular aspect of climate change, through a strict connection between science and art.

Thank you for your appreciation

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



2) Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes, the strategy of communication, engagement, and selection of the pictures for the exhibition is clearly reported, as well as the audience response expected from the authors. Also, the relation between the pictures, the places where they have been taken, and the specific issues of each are well reported. A suggestion would be to cite in paragraph 4 the initial number of pictures submitted for the internal call (before the selection of the final 26 for the exhibition), in order to understand the real participation to the initiative.

Thank you for the good suggestion. We shall add the number in the text. We received 130 photographs, among which we chose about 20% for the exhibition.

3) Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes, the good number of visitors and adopted communication strategies seem to confirm the engagement and vehiculation of the message the authors wanted to transmit through the pictures.

Thank you for this appreciation.

4) Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? It can be improved. The original contribution is not very clear: the organization of an exhibition of pictures, independently on the topic, is not an innovative approach for communication. The authors should stress more the attention given to details, such as public engagement and feelings.

We will clarify better in the manuscript what the originality of our contribution consists of. We agree with the reviewer, it is certainly not a novelty to organize exhibitions to communicate. Several photo exhibitions have been organized during these years by professional photographers and artists within projects devoted to enlarge the public awareness on this theme, using the art to strengthen the message(e.g., <https://sulletraccedeighiaccai.com>, <https://www.project-pressure.org/mariele-neudecker-and-project-pressure-partnership/>). We shall add

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

some reference to these initiatives in the revised manuscript, underlining their importance. As a specific example of initiatives aimed at integrating art and science, we will also include the Extreme Ice Survey program (<http://extremeicesurvey.org/>), which produced a photography book (Balog et al., 2012) and a documentary film, “Chasing Ice” (<https://chasingice.com/>), winner of an Emmy Award in 2014. However, it is unusual for scientists to organize exhibitions, as we did, making available the materials collected during scientific campaigns for study purposes different than the themes of the exhibition, thanks to the personal sensibility of the authors of the pictures. As reported in the article, all the authors are scientists involved in scientific activities on research cruises and not professional photographers. Some other online collections from scientists are available, like the one managed by the National Snow and Ice Data Center, https://nsidc.org/data/glacier_photo/, or the “Repeat Photography Project” of the USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center, focussed on the Glacier National Park, https://www.usgs.gov/centers/norock/science/repeat-photography-project?qt-science_center_objects=0#qt-science_center_objects. Another repository of pictures on various geoscience themes shot by the scientists is the images archive of EGU (<https://imadgeo.egu.eu/>). In this case, the archive is accessed by the scientific community, although geosciences involve a vast community. Only in some cases, the best photos, awarded during the annual conference, are printed as cards and reach a wider public. Our goal, on the contrary, was to fill the gap between research and society: the exhibition becomes the way to bring scientists near the public, and specifically, adult people, in working age, in an environment extraneous to science. The venue, in fact, was chosen among the places not usually used for scientific dissemination activities as the ones used for Science Cafè or conferences, but it was the hall of a chamber of commerce usually crowded during working hours. We wanted to talk about science, describing where the photos were taken, in which conditions, for which specific research project. In fact, some of us received many technical questions not only on climate change but on the geology and geomorphology of glaciers as well, thus adding value and a scientific significance to the artistic quality of

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



the images. This experience may be further stimulated within the research community, also to keep track and record of the fast changes occurring in the global glaciers, as well as finding among our pictures other themes to be exposed in similar exhibitions. We propose to add such considerations to clarify the originality of our contribution. We shall also add that the exhibition is now permanent in OGS premises, visible to all our visitors and collaborators. Balog, J. (2012) *Ice: Portraits of Vanishing Glaciers*, Rizzoli, 288 pp.

8) Is the language fluent and precise? It has to be improved. The overall style of the entire manuscript is too informal and double-check of typos and grammar errors over the entire manuscript is strongly suggested.

To ensure an adequate level of English, we intend to work with a professional English editing service to improve the overall style of the final version of the manuscript.

9) Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes. The topics related to climate change are usually well referenced in the manuscript. Also, science and communication have some references. I suggest adding a reference to the European Agenda 2030 and the Goals for Sustainable Developments in paragraph 1.

Thank you for this note. We will add in the manuscript the following reference : United Nations (2015). *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. A/RES/70/1 41 pp. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld/publication> We will also refer to the SDG n. 13 “Climate Action”, specific target 13.3 “Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning”, addressed by our exhibition.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
<https://gc.copernicus.org/preprints/gc-2020-3/gc-2020-3-AC1-supplement.pdf>

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

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

