

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

Idah Gatwiri Muchunku<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Multimedia University of Kenya

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The title and content of this article are very interesting and flow coherently and logically. However, the authors need to address the following concerns to make it stronger for publication in a scholarly journal:

1. Have a clear structure with standard sections of most journal articles included in your paper.
2. Currently, your article is missing a section titled 'Research Design/Methodology' where you should take time to explain how you collected data for the article. It is clear that this was primarily a qualitative desktop review of published works of climate science communicators, but you need to describe how you sampled the articles you reviewed and list those articles as an appendix or somewhere in your paper. Include the code of content analysis that you used during the review or explain how you used AI to review (what queries did you feed into the chatbot or AI tool?).
3. Secondly, include the theoretical framework. Which communication or language theory informed your study? Describe it briefly and show how it informed your study.
4. Thirdly, my opinion is that the aspect of disinformation is not the key subject of this paper and is very scantily covered even as an objective. I propose you do away with this theme and concentrate on the theme of 'boring language' that you have covered quite exhaustively. Disinformation is a whole big theme that requires another full paper to cover. So, kindly leave it out of this paper by deleting the little that you have said about disinformation.
5. Have a clear section labelled 'Recommendations'. You have several recommendations in your summary and conclusions (a section that you need to title clearly as so), but they just flow without highlighting them and having a clear section titled 'Recommendations.'
6. Generally, I deem these corrections as minor because this is a well-discussed paper that for sure should be published and its research findings disseminated. Only include structure as guided above to make it scholarly for the journal, i.e., clearly have sections that are labelled: Statement of the problem; Purpose of the study; Study objectives - one or two specific objectives; Study findings and discussions; summary and conclusions; recommendations. All this content is there in your paper but just flows like a story without proper structure.