This paper is an improvement from the version that was submitted last time. Significantly the supportive materials have primarily enriched with statistical facts and explanations of analysis procedures and methods. The data enhanced the most valuable part of this paper: the extensive and detailed survey about factors affecting geoscience communication and public engagement. The supplementary explanation in the manuscript and the justification of the methods are reasonable. However, this paper still needs minor changes.

Major comments:

In the methodology part, the authors only added the software and very technical data and SPSS and R data analysis procedure. Considering the Geoscience Communication journal's readers are mostly geoscience majors or communicators. I doubt the current methodology is useful for most of these readers. I recommend the authors give a bit of a simple explanation of the selected methods, even though they are standard methods for analyzing discrete data. This will also benefit other geoscientists interested in quantitatively analyzing similar surveys or designing similar experiments.

Secondly, to be informative, adding more information about the limitations of the methods and the experiment design would be appreciated mainly so that people can understand to what extent they can apply the insights to their situations. This limitation section can be a single section that inserts between the discussion and conclusion or add to the discussion.

Again overall, I think the study has good potential, and I look forward to reading the revised version.