

Response to the Editor and Executive Editor

Concerning the review of the manuscript “Towards family-friendly conferences in the geosciences: results from a first survey” by Elena Päßgen, Lisa Schielicke, and Leonie Esters submitted to Geoscience Communication (Preprint egusphere-2025-1200).

July 17, 2026

Dear Executive Editor, Solmaz Mohadjer, dear Editor, Katharine Welsh,

we thank you very much for your review and feedback on our manuscript. Many thanks, also for choosing our publication as a highlight paper.

In the following, your comments are highlighted in **bold and blue**, and our responses are shown in black. The mentioned line numbers refer to the tracked changes document.

Ln 26 - I think the word should be 'fostering' rather than 'foster'

Ln 84 - I think the word should be 'bring' rather than 'bringing'

The language mistakes were corrected in the text.

Ln 196 - Please check the figure reference, should this say Fig. 2a rather than just Fig.2

The figure reference was changed to Fig. 2a.

Ln 425 - This section should be 4.2 rather than 4.1 (although in the manuscript document, I can see that this has been changed) and I suggest renaming the section to something that is more reflective of the contents within the section as the entire paper relates directly to the online survey, so having this as a section heading is a little confusing.

We thank you for this feedback and agree that the heading does not give a clear indication of the content. We renamed the section to “Evaluation of survey findings”.

(1) The recommendations made in section 4.1 are important take-home messages for the readers. My suggestion is to make them more visible using bullets or a numbered list. Currently, these recommendations are a bit lost in the very long paragraph. Feel free to keep some text but bring more focus to your recommendations by taking them out of the text and making them more visually available to the readers.

We agree that the suggestions are currently lost in the paragraph. To make them more visible, we decided to highlight them by using a bold font. In this way, the reader can easily identify them.

Overall, we chose to retain the running text rather than converting the recommendations into a list, as we wanted to preserve the distinction between the discussion in this section and our guide provided in Appendix A. We added “The guide containing a checklist with our recommendations can be found in Appendix A.” as the first sentence of the paragraph, in italics, redirecting readers who prefer a direct list to the corresponding guide. We have also

restructured the section so that the description of the guide now appears at the beginning of the section, followed by the discussion of family-friendly offers.

(2) The introduction section is one very long paragraph that covers almost 3 pages. While the content is relevant and important, its presentation may discourage some readers from looking at it. I suggest to break this long paragraph into smaller bites to increase its readability.

(3) Same comment as above for section 4.2 (Online Survey). Please break the long section into shorter readable paragraphs.

Both the Introduction section and section 4.2 (Online Survey) were split into subsections.