Caveat: This is a brief community comment, in which the authors and editors should note a potential conflict of interest as I am an Exec. Editor of Geoscience Communication [Not handling editor for this manuscript] and because I'm clearly pointing to my own work.

Comment: I do not pretend a full overview of this subject area, but have a few specific pieces of knowledge that the authors might consider incorporating. The two non-editorials might either be outside the scope of the authors definitions of 'communicating climate science', or out of scope due to their publication/submission date. However, very briefly noting them might help (i) sharpen their definition/scope which I didn't read as excluding the suggestions I make and (ii) and potentially recognise upcoming work.

Use the community? There may also be an opportunity to ask the community to contribute examples they know by commenting on the discussion paper.

Why are the following out of scope?

- https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/1/35/2018/ - Contains a communication activity that is evaluated.
- Suggest the authors review papers published in *Geoscience Communication*.

Detail of 4 papers: In Section 2.1 'Importance of Evaluation', it might be worth nothing that this aligns entirely with *GC*s principles for publication as outlined in two editorials

- https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/1/1/2018/
- https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/4/493/2021/

There is also a paper of mine that was in *GC Discussions* since June 2023 on '*A tool to co-create impactful university-industry projects for natural hazard risk mitigation'*, which contains an evaluation (Case Study) of a project on climate-driven hydrological risk.
https://egusphere.copernicus.org/preprints/2023/egusphere-2023-1251/
The project output is a blog published by the Bank of England -
https://bankunderground.co.uk/2021/04/08/its-windy-when-its-wet-why-uk-insurers-may-need-to-reassess-their-modelling-assumptions/

I have also just submitted a GC Insights paper (after the submission of your manuscript) explicitly to evaluate a project to communicate climate related risk.

- The output of that work is https://bankunderground.co.uk/2023/04/13/what-if-its-a-perfect-storm-stronger-evidence-that-insurers-should-account-for-co-occurring-weather-hazards/
- 'Open R-code to communicate the impact of co-occurring natural hazards' - egusphere-2023-2799. https://egusphere.copernicus.org/preprints/2023/egusphere-2023-2799/

All the best,

John Hillier