

I would like to thank all the reviewers for their interesting and useful suggestions. I concentrate mainly in the last three reviews, since they address the issue of the evaluation of the method.

Lancaster writes: “there is mention made in this paper of the size and demographics of audiences attending public presentations of this work; the authors are encouraged to provide this data as a supplementary table if it is at all available”.

I invite authors to meet the request if they are able to.

Gordon encourages to strengthen the conceptual framework by reference to the wider literature on best practice in interpretation, particularly in relation to stimulating emotional responses and encouraging memorable experiences involving a range of senses and interactive engagement. I believe that the authors have accepted this suggestion. But I would like to stress what Gordon says: “Emotional experience and making personal connections can be a powerful basis for subsequent positive actions or behavioural changes by those participating - either people attending the events described or visitors to the sites”. This assertion is corroborated by studies as Gordon himself underline in his comment.

To meet Reeve claims: “The point about evaluation is particularly important when you mention that the methods “arouse an emotional and intellectual experience that enables a personal connection to the place”. We basically want to know exactly how this “new approach” was developed and evaluated.

In evaluating the method, communication using art can already count on the powerful basis already underlined by Gordon. I would like also to remind that this is a paper for a Special Issue that particularly address works on Earth sciences and Art, a field that is “work in progress”, and that eventually can bring to the contamination of the two methodologies in approaching the public. I invite to read my introduction to the volume and the studies I quoted already performed on the synergies of such collaboration. Moreover, most of the projects have been carried out by artists in collaboration with scientists. It is not mandatory that scientists are also science communicators, while I believe that for an artist to make a study on the impact of his work on the public it is not fundamental. They are not accustomed to do an evaluation of the social impact of their artworks, at least from a scientific perspective.

Nevertheless, to encourage authors to meet at their best the issues discussed and concerning the evaluation of the method and the need and relevance of their work, I suggested directly to them further review.