

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

Ni Putu Wulan Purnama Sari¹

¹ Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors, what an interesting view! This is a breakthrough. You asked us to go back to the basic values of communication, which are vital and essential; it is language indeed. Related to climate change, all we need is the proof. We see, then we believe, as simple as that. It will be complicated when what we see is not the real thing or when not the whole thing happens. Actually, the proof of climate change is out there; we experience it, like it or not, realize it or not. The plus and minus of using the "boring language," a.k.a. the frequently used language, or the suggested creative language, must exist. In my view, the most important thing is how both types of language may stress the communication of climate change's proof to the public. As long as we reach this goal, then both languages may be used together in combination. As the "boring language" is more familiar to the public, it raises general understanding among us. It has its own charm because when people read or hear it, we understand and get the meaning fast. When we hear or read a new term or some creative words, perhaps it takes a few more minutes to think about the exact meaning. It may raise another assumption, the thing we want to escape from. I suggest the combination of the "boring" and the "creative" languages in communicating sciences related to climate change. It may strike the novelty issues without leaving the essential meaning behind. What a great perspective anyway. This could be a new direction for future studies in climate and communication sciences. Please keep up the good work.