

## ***Interactive comment on “Communicating uncertainties in spatial predictions of grain micronutrient concentration” by Christopher Chagumaira et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 11 February 2021

The paper includes a lot of statistical terminology and detail of methods. I assume intended audience is those with knowledge of statistical terminology and methods. Possible lost opportunity to appeal to a wider audience given that emphasis on communicating uncertainties.

Table 1. Would like to see the poster designs. This would add context to the subsequent discussion

Might the questions in Table 3 encourage participants to say ‘Message clear’ to show they understand what they are being shown? Does this introduce bias in the way the question is worded? If author agrees, there is an opportunity here to acknowledge this

C1

or show has this has been accounted for in subsequent questions.

Figure 2 – Perhaps add a key to explain what the O indicates. This isn’t that clear to a non-specialist

L21 – Perhaps worth alluding to the ethical issues surrounding the ethics of interventions to improve the dietary intake of Se. Whilst this is not the subject of the paper, worth noting perhaps.

L32 – Nugget variance – assumption that readers will know what this is. Author could include glossary/footnote

L225 – Good to see acknowledgement off possible differences between different groups. Suggest further group work with other participants may increase validity of study. Could this be a suggestion for future work?

L225-232 Good recognition of potential for bias

L232 Different learning styles may also affect how people interpret posters

L350 – Conclusion about users finding information presented accessible and clear – responses could have been affected by the desire to show understand the representation. I think the leading nature of the question could be seen as significant. Suggest consider acknowledging this possibility

L360-362 – Agree with statement that further work is needed

L389-390 – Agree with statement that further work needs to ensure sufficient number of participants – bigger sample size

L419-420 – Would like to see how measures of uncertainty are presented – and how these less effective methods of communication (kriging variance and confidence intervals) could be presented in a more effective way