

Review of: "Boring Language Is Constraining the Impact of Climate Science"

Stefano Mammola¹

¹ National Research Council

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I read with interest the article by Vuong et al. Intuitively, I mostly agree with the premise of the study that the impact of climate science is being constrained by poor communication ("boring language"), failing to deliver its main messages to the public and stakeholders alike. However, in my opinion, the main message of the paper is not supported by the analysis performed by the authors.

The authors picked up 5 papers at random from Google Scholar and extracted the frequency of words used therein. From this analysis, they conclude that climate science papers "... are frequently repetitious and lack creativity."

I see two main problems with this analysis:

1. A sample size of 5 papers is simply not enough to draw any solid conclusions about climate science, a discipline where thousands of papers are published each year.
2. The frequency of words in papers doesn't really inform about the usage of these words, and thus the link between the results presented in table 1 and the conclusion that climate science writers are not creative is speculative at best.

On a side note, I think all the discourse on disinformation about climate science should be more strongly supported by evidence. For example, it would be great to have solid references for the fact that "... exposure to disinformation has a clear adverse impact on belief in climate change, the ability to detect disinformation, and pro-environmental behavior."