

## Referee 2

We want to thank Dr. Robyn Pickering for her comments.

Gani et al present a thoughtful, well researched and compelling editorial on what they term the 'shadowlands' of science communication. They clearly present the value of science communication and identify the issues pushing this into the shadowlands. They then offer some interesting perspectives and clear recommendations. This is a valuable piece and I enjoyed reading it very much and am delighted to be in a position to offer some comments.

My main and central comment is on the use of language and the distinction between 'science' (implying the entire arc of all things scientific) and 'geoscience' (more focused on the earth and earth processes). The use of both terms and both meanings belongs in this piece but there are many times where narrowing the discussion and scope to 'geosciences' I believe is appropriate. This is a Geoscience journal, from a geoscience society, written by a group of geoscientists, for an audience predominantly of geoscientists! I don't wish to labour this point, but I think the addition of 'geo' to many of the instances in which 'science' is mentioned will focus and strengthen the arguments and piece in general. There are generic points about science communication but the examples and recommendations, especially related to hazards, are more geoscience. My recommendation is that the authors critically assess almost every mention of 'science' and see if replacing this with 'geoscience' would work better. For example section 3.3 could be 'Geoscience communication as a professional activity'.

We agree with the reviewer and will: 1) focus the discussion on geoscience communication, and 2) thoroughly review the entire text to reassess the use of 'science' (as opposed to 'geoscience').

I am not sure if section 1.2 is necessary - it's a nice literature review but in my view does not add much to the paper and could either be condensed into the introduction or left out. This will also make the piece shorter and more focused.

We will condense and streamline Sections 1.1 and 1.2 to address these points (similar suggestion by Referee 1).

In section 2, the term 'shadowlands' is discussed in more detail. My sense is these authors are introducing this term for the first time? If yes, maybe add some text saying 'in our opinion' or 'from our perspective'. This is such a useful phrase and way of looking at improving geoscience communication, I think the authors should take credit for it!

We will incorporate the change suggested by the reviewer to take credit for the phrase.

Figure 1 is really clear and useful.

Thank you

In section 2.3.1, I wonder if the authors would like to be even clearer and call out the Whiteness of geoscience - rather than just say how low the percentage of minoritized groups. There are two articles which clearly articulate the Whiteness of geosciences: Dutt, 2020, Nature Geoscience and Berhe et al., 2022, Nature Geoscience. From my perspective, this section can be strengthened by being clearer - geosciences does not just have a low percentage of everyone else, our field is predominantly White and this Whiteness carries a lot of privilege.

This is an excellent suggestion. We will incorporate it and are grateful for the references.

Following on from this point, in the next paragraph, there is a very well written argument about the 'invisible labour' done mainly by women. Again, I wonder if this section can be even more specific, rather than just saying this labour is done mainly by women, say that male privilege shields many geoscientists from feeling pressured or obliged to undertake this labour. Then intersect this with race, and we have White male privilege vs minoritized women burdened with additional and invisible labour. A recommendation out of making this discussion more explicit could be that better geoscience communication needs to be more representative, which in this case requires broader participation.

We will incorporate this recommendation in our revised manuscript.

In summary, this is a thoughtful, well written, timely piece which will generate further discussion, as well as recording where we are right now in understanding and bettering geoscience communication. I look forward to seeing the final version published.

Thank you.