

Interactive comment on “Science, Poetry, and Music for Landscapes of the Marche Region, Italy. Teaching the Conservation of Natural Heritage” by Olivia Nesci and Laura Valentini

Mathew Stiller-Reeve

mathew@stillerreeve.no

Received and published: 29 June 2020

Dear Olivia Nesci and co-authors,

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 reviewed your abstract using a structured worksheet 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 important elements of a research abstract and we comment on them below. We hope the following is helpful for your revisions. It’s im-

C1

portant to note that Geoscience Communication puts a lot of emphasis on evaluation of communication practice and ensuring that the practice is based on a solid research question and research design. The articles need to tell the story of research on geoscience communication and not just tell the story of geoscience communication that’s been done.

Overall: Your project sounds very interesting and we were really interested in this “new approach” and how it combines these different media. The abstract touches on some very interesting elements and issues, which made us want to read on. However, there are a few things we believe should be improved for this to be relevant for a peer-reviewed publication.

Title: The title reflects the abstract rather well as it stands. However, we were left wondering how important the idea of “conservation of natural heritage” is, and why this is not explained (or used) in the Abstract below. We also failed to understand what the focus of the paper was (which we also reflect upon below). Is the paper about teaching methods or is it about creating a personal connection or appreciation for the geo-sites in question?

Need and relevance: We understood clearly that the project has produced lots of interesting outputs, but the Abstract does not tell the reader why. At the moment, the main relevance of this project seems to be linked to the larger project that you describe. We would suggest that you should move information about the larger project from the Abstract and to the main body of the paper. You should focus on the need and relevance of your project in particular. Why is this “new approach” needed and what might it achieve?

Question/Hypothesis The main question for the research behind this “new approach” was also unclear. We wondered if the main aim was to create a new pedagogical resource, but we could not be sure. The main aim (and the question behind it) needs to come across a lot clearer.

C2

Methods: We assume that the “plain language accompanied by visual stimulations, poetry, and ancient music” are the main methods used. However, it would be nice to have an idea about why these were chosen and how they have been evaluated. 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. Hopefully you can easily extract this information from the main bulk of the paper.

Results and conclusions You start by saying that you develop a “new approach in science communication”. One of the main results should therefore be a description and evaluation of this “new approach”. It would be great if the Abstract could contain some more information about this.

Take-home message We agreed that the last couple of sentences in the Abstract mirrored the same message as the first couple of sentences. In the end you say that you “intend to educate people to have a new perception of geo-sites”. However, it would be nice to have a statement at the end, which states whether you actually succeeded in educating the people to have this new perception. In other words, we want to hear whether your “new approach” actually had the impact that you intended in the beginning.

Clarity We thought some sentences were quite repetitive (as we mentioned directly above). Clearing up these sentences would free up space for you to expand more on the need, relevance, aim/question, and methods behind this study. Some of us also saw some sentences which could be reduced in size. For example the sentence “ The project is documented through live multidisciplinary performances, the publication of project materials in a book with a DVD attached, and through a web site with the same contents” could be edited to “The project resulted in live multidisciplinary performances, a book, a DVD and a web site.”

C3

We hope you find these comments and suggestions useful. We really liked the sound of the project from the Abstract! We really hope that you can clarify some of the important points that we have mentioned to ensure that the Abstract contains all the important elements that it should and that it reflects the paper in a just and fair way.

Good luck!

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://gc.copernicus.org/preprints/gc-2020-5/gc-2020-5-SC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-5>, 2020.

C4