

## ***Interactive comment on “SUstaiNability: a science communication website on environmental research” by T. Gravina et al.***

**R. Vicari (Referee)**

rosa.vicari@leesu.enpc.fr

Received and published: 26 February 2016

This paper addresses the issues of the use of social networks and the role of researchers in science outreach. These are currently popular topics that call attention to key issues such as the quality of science outreach in the context of widespread production and access to cultural contents through the Web. These topics are relevant to the understanding of natural hazards, and in particular of the consequences on populations that are aware or not of natural hazards in their territory. The manuscript is well structured and concise and deserves to be published. However several concepts and arguments should be clarified before publication, and the use of English language could be improved. I should mention that I work on geoscience communication, in particular related to climate change and extreme weather issues, however I'm not an expert in the methods used for data analysis, meaning that my review will not primarily

focus on this point.

General comments:

- The authors stress out that researchers should be actively involved in science outreach. It would be important to specify to what degree researchers involvement is suited and it should be discussed if this promotional activity is compatible with scientists' research agenda and objectives. This is a sensitive topic that deserves a thorough analysis of what are the advantages and disadvantages of replacing professional mediators (such as journalists, museum curators, or communication executives) with scientists in science outreach activities.
- English language should be improved: some examples of linguistic mistakes are mentioned under "Technical corrections", it's not an exhaustive list.

Specific comments:

Abstract

- p.1 l.9: the notion of "participatory journalism" has specific meaning and implications ; it would be preferable to not refer to this concept in the abstract since the authors don't mention and discuss it in the rest of the paper;

1) Introduction

- p.1 l.19-20: The following statement needs to be clarified and justified or nuance should be added to it: "Science communication purpose is dissemination of scientific culture to general public without any educational intent.";
- p.2 l.12-14: This statement should be supported with relevant data and it should be specified what corresponds to a "sufficiently clear and correct" form according to the authors.

2) Materials methods

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



- p.3 I.30: The authors should clearly define what they mean by “average education”;
- p.3 I.30 – p.4 I.1: The news writing approach described here corresponds to some of the basic principles of journalistic writing. It would be preferable to mention it.

### 3) Results and discussion

- p.5 I.32 – p.6 I.1: This statement should be supported with stronger arguments;
- p.6 I.30-33: Other possible explanations should be considered, for example the fact that older articles have been circulating for longer time on Web search engines (e.g. Google search) and social networks;
- p.7 I.5-7: It would be relevant to develop a hypothesis to explain this web users’ behaviour;
- p.7 I.20-22: a channel of communication can be considered “effective” in relation to specific communication goals : it would be relevant to make more explicit the communication objectives of the website, to explain how social networks support the achievement of these goals, and to clarify which data support this statement;
- p.7 I.24-28: this kind of websites are widespread worldwide, it is essential to clarify what is innovative in the website [www.sunability.unina2.it](http://www.sunability.unina2.it).

#### Technical corrections

English language should be improved: some examples of linguistic mistakes are mentioned below; it’s not an exhaustive list.

- p.1 I.11: there should be the article “the” before “Second University of Naples”; articles are frequently missing all along the paper.
- p.1 I.19: there should be the article “the” before “general public”;
- p.2 I.14: “in a form sufficiently clear and correct” should be replaced with “in a sufficiently clear and correct form”;

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

- p.2 l.20: “among” should replace “between” after “interactions”;
- p.3 l.12: “through” should replace “by” before “social networks”;
- p.3 l.14 “location” should replace “convenience”;
- p.3 l.19 “located” should replace “collocated”;
- p.3 l.22 “includes” should replace “included”;
- p.4 l.3 “social media buttons were available” should replace “showed social media buttons”;
- p.4 l.6: “published on” should replace “ inserted”;
- p.4 l.7: “published” should replace “ inserted”;
- p.4 l.7: “two other articles” should replace “other two articles”.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2015-305, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

