

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

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 29 April 2020

General Comments The manuscript is focused on an actual topic: fostering public engagement and awareness of climate change risks through a photographic exhibition of glaciers. Particular attention has been given to the communication strategy, as well as to pictures selection. The choice to prefer positive and hope messages, although considering the seriousness of the topic, is an effective strategy. In general, the research approach is quite good, the topic is well introduced, and the methodology of the work is clearly shown. The research methodology and the results are convincing. Following comments might help improve the quality of the manuscript.

Specific comments 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

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



a strict connection between science and art. 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 citing 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. 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. 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. 5. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes. 6. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes but the language style is too informal. 7. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes, the aim of the authors is clear and understandable. 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 typos and grammar errors over the entire manuscript is strongly suggested. 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 European Agenda 2030 and the Goals for Sustainable Developments in paragraph 1.

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

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-3>, 2020.