

# Review of: "Climate Change Denial Theories, Skeptical Arguments, and the Role of Science Communication"

Lucian Sfîcă<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Iasi

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

The major problem is that this article is not constructed on a precise method, but only expresses the personal opinion of the authors on the issue of climate change. We have here more a blog article than a scientific article. In many points, only a perspective on the issue arises, as in „scientists themselves have not been proactive and „sincere” in communicating scientific information”. This is obviously a generalization because many scientists are proactive and very sincere on the topic. Moreover, if we talk about personal points of view, in my humble opinion, it is not the role of the scientists to „persuade others” on no matter the issue they investigate. Science brings facts, experiments, explanations, and arguments which should be convincing and persuasive on their own. The scientist should not be perceived as a propaganda agent.

What is the meaning of the majority of scientists? Can we advance something like percentages for a sound assessment?

Introduction/Paragraph 2: „human activities are exacerbating” This idea suggests that climate change has a natural background overlapped by human activities. Basically, this is not rigorous since some studies indicate that based exclusively on natural drivers, the climate should be colder. Please clarify!

Introduction/Paragraph 2: Nowadays, the skepticism on climate change is restricted to the human cause because it is quite impossible to question if „this phenomenon is indeed occurring”. This was more specific in the period 1985-2000.

In my opinion, having doubts on some mitigation measures is not a part of climate skepticism. One could fully understand that climate change is manifesting and is convinced that it is driven by human emissions, but could doubt some proposed measures by the politicians worldwide. This is no more related to climate change skepticism, but to a different approach on how to avoid climate change impacts.

Page 3/paragraph 4: It is obviously impossible to eliminate such an approach if we consider the freedom of speech a value of our society. The idea is maybe to minimize these points of view and their impact in society.

The source of the graph in Figure 1 should be presented.

Page 5/paragraph 2: Actually, in the United States, there is a well-known recognized difference in the approach to climate change between Democrats and Republicans. Please reinforce this point in the manuscript.

Page 5/paragraph 3: „suggests” seems not to be the proper term here. Theories, such as that of climate change,

are/should be based on certitudes.

Page 5/paragraph 3: Please let me consider that a consensus of 100% is humanly impossible on any possible scientific topic. And who is the subject of the consensus: the entire population or only the scientists?

Page 5/paragraph 3: In phrases like „Desert areas are expanding, heatwaves and wildfires are becoming more common,.....” citations have to follow directly each indicated change.

Page 5/paragraph 4: This paragraph is doubtful. Which warming occurred in the 1970s? That period was more a cooling period in its first part with a breakpoint indicating the shift toward warming in the last years. Please rephrase the paragraph!