

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

Mai Osama Ghoraba<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ain Shams University

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

The idea of this research is very creative and promising. The language used is quite “interesting”. However, the buildup of this study is lacking scientific evidence as well as rigorous scientific methodology. Thus, the resulting paper cannot be classified as a piece of research or a “study”; it resembles the style of magazines and newspapers' articles (i.e., the inclusion of personal anecdotes, the subjective or biased claims without scientific evidence).

To enhance the quality of this research, I recommend the following:

- Adding a complete literature review of the tackled topic, signaling all previous publications about the “boring use of language,” “the genre of scientific communication,” and/or the effectiveness of scientific communication about climate change.
- The gap in literature should be pointed out. Why is this research important? What is the scientific proof of the relevance of this study for either the public or the scientific community? Is there scientifically proven evidence that the public is completely uninterested in the scientific publication about climate change due to its boring language?
- Before commenting on the materials and methods used, there should have been a theoretical foundation about properties of the language of scientific writing in general and the genre of scientific writing about environmental problems in particular.
- The repetition of lexical items is not significant until it is compared to a reference corpus, ideally of a similar genre (I strongly recommend here checking resources about “keywords analysis”).
- A thorough explanation of the method used should be provided. For instance, why did you pick just “five” random articles? Why did you choose to study the language of scientific papers about climate change in particular? You could have chosen books, UN reports, etc.
- How do you get to the conclusion to label the selected studies as “uninteresting”? Firstly, you should clarify what the factors are that make a message interesting or uninteresting based on scientific or statistical data. Secondly, you should measure the interest of these papers with either surveys or factorial analysis. There should be a method to test the effectiveness or the interest of the selected genre of scientific publication.
- The conclusions should respond to the study's question and result from the study's analysis.