**Reviewer A**

**Points that I would like to know and that could improve the article: How is the profile's audience characterized? Are they people outside the academic community or are they people inside the biology and biodiversity community?**

A: While we believe it is extremely important to have a well-sound profile of the target audience for directing future activities, this analysis is something that is still lacking on our project. Therefore, we cannot provide any quantifiable information. We pretend to address this in the future in a proper study case paper on our activities. In this piece, we highlighted the importance to characterize the audience (as well as the participant researchers) for creating communication strategies at the last but one paragraph.

**Reviewer B**

**From the theoretical standpoint, the manuscript is based on the deficit model (as indicated in lines 24-27), in which there is an understanding of a society divided between specialists and laypeople. In this sense, this model considers that the transmission of knowledge would eliminate the gap between scientists and laypeople. There are criticisms of this unidirectional model of knowledge transfer. I suggest reading Chapter 1 of the book “Pesquisa em Divulgação Científica: Textos Escolhidos”, edited by Ildeu de Castro Moreira and Luisa Massarani and available at the link** [**https://www.inct-cpct.ufpa.br/index/2021/04/22/new-book-research-in-scientific-disclosure-chosen-texts/**](https://www.inct-cpct.ufpa.br/index/2021/04/22/new-book-research-in-scientific-disclosure-chosen-texts/)

A: We appreciate the reading suggestion. On this reading, and also the reading of another chapter defending the Deficit model within the same book, it seems that all four presented models in the suggested chapter have some criticism upon them. Since we do not discuss effectiveness and the theoretical background on which SciComm projects should be based on in this short opinion piece, we do not see how this information could be integrated within it. We would appreciate any direct suggestions.

**The target audience of the “Biodiversidade em Foco” profile was not defined in the text. Have you done any analysis to understand who the followers are (e.g., age, gender, education), interests and beliefs? Despite Twitter being a social network with wide dissemination, it is important to pay attention to the specific needs of the audience for greater engagement. Recognizing the target audience is about improving dialogue and encouraging the participation of followers in the process of content creation and knowledge appropriation, as suggested at the end of the manuscript (lines 100-114). As well as the profile of the researchers who contributed as content creators (lines 46-47).**

A: While we believe it is extremely important to have a well-sound profile of the target audience for directing future activities, this analysis is something that is still lacking on our project. Therefore, we cannot provide any quantifiable information. We have information on most of the scientists that participated in the activity, but it falls outside of the scope of this opinion piece. We pretend to address both matters in a proper study case paper on our activities in the future, after characterizing the audience profile. In this specific piece, we highlighted the importance to characterize the audience (as well as the participant researchers) for creating communication strategies at the last but one paragraph in the current version.

**Why did you choose twitter? There are other social networks being used for scientific dissemination. The advantages of this platform need to be better defined in the text.**

A: “Why” we chose Twitter and the advantages of the platform are two slightly different questions. A part of the “Why we chose” is very much circumstantial and based on personal preferences from the authors, which we believe is out of the scope of this piece. Nonetheless, we included the advantages of using social media and specifically Twitter mainly in the end of the second paragraph.

**There are data available on the Public Perception of Science and Technology in Brazil conducted by Centro de Gestão e Estudo Estratégicos (CGEE) (CGEE) of the Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação (MCTI). According to the study, 61% of respondents are interested or very interested in Science and Technology (S&T) and the Environment (78%). Providing context to this manuscript and opposing the claim “The government is nonetheless celebrated by a large portion of the population displaying strong scientific denialism and promoting pseudo-facts and conspiracy theories” (lines 22-23).**

A: We agree that the CGEE provides a background for public perception of science in Brazil, but we disagree that it opposes our claims. The abovementioned document does not go deep in understanding what people mean about “being interest in science” and if it leads to a strengthened scientific education. In another words, one can both say that is interested in science and be a science denialist to climate change. Nonetheless, we now cite the high public interest in science by Brazilians and toned down the “celebrated by a large portion of the population”.

**In the introduction it would be interesting to add examples related to Brazilian biodiversity, since it is the key subject of the profile. The Fires in the Amazon or Pantanal are examples of hot topics.**

A: We mention these examples in the Introduction now.

**In lines 79-83, briefly describe what the stories of Verônica Marques and Suzane Barboza are about or indicate what these stories have in common. Example: Two students from the Graduate Program in Ecology at UFRJ, women and residents of the periphery of Rio de Janeiro, shared the difficulties of access and of remaining in academy.**

A: We restructured this part of the text following your suggestion.

**In lines 84-87, it is important to reinforce that, in addition to individual efforts, institutional, transdisciplinary efforts and a demand for public policies are needed. The discussion on the reduction of the budget for Science and Technology also affects scientific dissemination. This is because it suffers from the effects of budget cuts for training professionals and conducting campaigns. to disseminate scientific and technical knowledge. Disclosure by self-organizing scientists is necessary, however it should not be seen as the only way out “but in countries with low investment in science, this may not be an option, and individuals must act.” It is possible to reconcile the articulation for scientific dissemination with the demands of investment in science.**

A: We agree with you that is necessary to reinforce the importance of institutional and governmental actions since our first version was too much “individual-based”. We rephrased this part of the text.