GEOSCIENCE COMMUNICATION

Open Access

EGU

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Demonstrating change from a drop-in engagement activity through pre- and post- graffiti walls: Quantitative linguistics and thematic analysis applied to a space soundscape exhibit" *by* Martin O. Archer et al.

Mathew Stiller-Reeve (Editor)

mathew@stillerreeve.no

During a recent virtual writing retreat, we used a peer-review framework to review your abstract. We then had an open discussion and noted down all the feedback. We also reviewed your abstract with the following advice in mind: "The abstract is a condensed and concentrated version of the full text of the research manuscript. It should be sufficiently representative of the paper if read as a stand-alone document". We looked for the important elements that we believe should be in a research abstract and we comment on them below. We hope the following is helpful for your revisions.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

Overall: We were really interested in your project, this "new approach" of graffiti walls and how you have evaluated them. The graffiti walls are a fun method, and we also really liked how you link methods for analysing vocabulary and illustrations. The word "cool" came up a lot when we discussed your project!

The Abstract contained all the necessary parts, which was very positive. You might want to consider tightening up or re-focussing some of these parts to make the Abstract clearer and more concise.

Title: The title contains a lot of information which is great. However, we hope you can make it shorter and more concise. It seems to put more emphasis on the evaluation analyses you used rather than the innovation of the graffiti walls themselves. Several in the group had to read the title several times to pick up on the message. A couple of people misunderstood and thought that the graffiti wall was within the soundscape itself, and that you tested the soundscape before and after the wall was graffitied on.

Need and relevance: The first sentence conveys the need and relevance of the research. However, please consider editing so that it is clearer. Maybe consider two sentences.

Question/hypothesis: Here we misunderstood whether the focus was the graffiti walls being the evaluation itself or the evaluation of the graffiti walls. Right now, it seems that the evaluation methods of quantitative linguistics and thematic analysis could be the main focus of the research question. However, we feel that the graffiti walls themselves are meant to be the main issue. This confusion probably comes from the use of "analysis", "evaluation", "techniques" and "method" in rather quick succession. You might want to look into this to ensure the focus of your main research question/objective is clearly conveyed.

Methods: The methods used for evaluating the graffiti walls are interesting and novel. It's good that you state both methods in the Abstract, but it's not clear what the methods actually do. This part gets quite confusing since it is technically contained in a 5-line

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

sentence, with several clauses. You might consider splitting the methods and results more clearly, and not containing so much detail.

Results: Your main results should refer back to whether the graffiti walls themselves functioned as an evaluation tool. You may also want to refer back to the aim of the whole exhibit. Yes, the graffiti walls may show change, but do they show change relevant to the aim of the actual exhibit itself? Again, the text gets a little complex at this point especially where you write "dynamism, emptiness and electricity, areas highly relevant to the underlying space plasma physics of the sonified data". Our group got a little lost here and asked whether this level of technicality was necessary in the Abstract. You might consider referring to these terms in the main text where you have more room to explain.

Take-home message: You have some really nice results here, that we think you can convey stronger in the final two sentences. Refer to the graffiti walls specifically again and what potential they have. By writing "more broadly" makes it sound like they are already being used in certain circles. Do you mean "more broadly" within soundscapes exhibits or "more broadly" for all drop-in activities in science communication?

Clarity: When it comes to clarity and conciseness, we would like to ask you to consider whether there are redundant words in the Abstract that you could delete. We would also like you to try and split some of the complex sentences to help with the flow of the story.

Spelling/grammar: We all had an issue with the use of "pre- and post-X" with no noun after, in both the title and the text. We're pretty sure you did not mean pre- and post-graffiti walls. If you meant pre- and post-activity graffiti walls, that makes more sense. But you may want to simply use "before and after" as you do later in the text. That's much easier for the reader (us) to relate to.

Again, this seems like a really innovative and exciting project. We hope our comments and suggestions help to make the Abstract even better.

Kind regards, Mathew Stiller-Reeve and several members of The Norwegian Research School for Dynamics and Evolution of Earth and Planets (DEEP)

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://gc.copernicus.org/preprints/gc-2020-41/gc-2020-41-EC1-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-41, 2020.