

Interactive comment on “From geoscientific "matters of fact" to societal "matters of concern": a transdisciplinary training approach to communicating earthquake risk in Istanbul (Turkey)” by J. Ickert and I. S. Stewart

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 February 2016

Being a geoscientist also trained in risk communication, I am very happy to see such type of paper. I would like to thank you for this very interesting piece of work. It highlights the very important topic of geoscientists as communicators. However, I believe that some improvements (transparency of the methodology, inclusion of relevant literature, deeper discussions) are needed to make this paper excellent. Please see my specific comments below.

The title is somehow misleading. I think it is very well phrased and striking but not very appropriate in my opinion. Your discussion points are not only valid for young geo-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



scientists' training but also for the general conduct of geocommunication. Moreover, although you advocate for a transdisciplinary training approach in your discussion, you use an example (the ALerT project) that could be perceived as not really transdisciplinary as most participants are geoscientists. With this title, someone can expect to be introduced to a successful example of social sciences/geosciences training approach.

First paragraph of the introduction: all these sentences deserve to be supported by literature. These are bold statements that can be argued. If those are not taken from literature, please clarify that they reflect your point of view or your experience. This comment is also valid for other sentences throughout the paper, for example page 3 lines 3-6.

Also related to literature review, I think you do not put your work in perspective of the huge discussion that is already existing on the role of natural hazard geoscientists as communicators and on the need of transdisciplinary approaches. I miss a literature section on this. A lot of scientists and organizations have already advocated for these needs. As an example, the paper of David Liverman ("Communicating Geological Hazards: Educating, Training and Assisting Geoscientists in Communication Skills") or the "Geoscience and Natural Hazards Policy" Position Statement of the Geological Society of America. Moreover, related to the L'Aquila earthquake, the debate was fierce. And very apropos, you have already the sentence to introduce such literature review section (page 6, line 11).

Page 4: small inconsistency between line 19 and line 31. You say that around half of the researchers come from Turkey but then you state that most of the participants are unfamiliar with the Turkish cultural context. The use of "most" is probably not appropriate.

I miss a methodology section about the interviews with the inhabitants. This is a question of transparency. You should state how much people were interviewed, who they were, by whom they were interviewed, what were the questions. In more general terms,

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



what was the research design? In this section, the research design of the workshop should also appear, e.g. mention of focus group method, the professional identity of the facilitator.

I like the fact that some of the interviewees' statements appear in the bulk of the paper itself. However, here again I see a transparency issue. The reader cannot judge if the chosen pieces are representative of the whole sample. For sure you mention additional testimonies to make your point: for example, page 9, lines 25-30; page 12, lines 14-21; page 15, lines 14-25; page 16, lines 7-13; or page 17, lines 19-25. I would like to see those statements as well. Maybe in a supplementary material file that could be accessed in the online version of the paper if you think that a table directly in the paper is too much.

Also related to the interviewees' statements, I found that they are not always very well chosen. For example, page 8 in relation to participation. The statement that is summarized in the 26 seems to be a better highlight of the complaints than the one provided in line 23-24.

Page 12, line 2: "four principal areas of concerns", what were the others ones? Explicitly mention why you chose to present only those.

Page 12, line 18: here by "participants" do you refer to only the Turkish ones or the whole group? I would also have liked to know which of the researchers are Turkish or not. As you mention, the cultural aspect is important, so it would be interesting to see if there are perception's differences between the participants in relation to this point and also to see some discussion about that.

On the same line, I would have expected a deeper discussion section as well as greater use of the literature on some of the issues brought up by the participants, e.g. cultural aspects (page 13, lines 16-23) or the role of the geoscientists in communication (pages 14, lines 31-32). Additionally, you do not challenge some points: e.g. "strict allocation of time spent on communication activities was seen as unrealistic". You certainly know

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



that outreach activities are compulsory for some Horizon2020 projects and thus time must be allocated to those.

Page 18, lines 23-25: provide references.

Page 19, section 6.3: Examples of universities proposing a joint technical and science communication master could be added as a good practice.

Technical corrections: Page 6, line 22: one “for” too much. Page 15, line 25: “in order t
It was”

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-26, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

