

Thank you for your work in improving the manuscript. As stated previously, the research questions posed are engaging, and the study contributes to the field. Although the manuscript has seen significant improvement, there are still areas that need attention.

General Comments:

The grammar and spelling still need considerable improvement and are not yet at a publishable level. This includes correcting typos, grammar, and sentence structures; using appropriate linking words; ensuring consistent comma usage; removing double periods (lines 164 and 309); and unifying the capitalization of game titles (e.g., line 289). Also, check Figure 1 for typos.

Write out numbers below ten and apply this rule consistently. For example, in line 191, "twenty-two" is written out, while "5" in the line above is written as an Arabic numeral.

Methodology:

I do not support your claim that methodological triangulation was used. What is described as a literature review appears to be primarily the references used in the discussion and results sections to support arguments, rather than an independent research method. Since the study does not employ a systematic or structured approach—such as a systematic review, scoping review, or meta-analysis—to synthesize existing knowledge, it appears that only two research methods were applied (content analysis and expert focus groups). Therefore, it would be more accurate either to remove this reference to methodological triangulation, explicitly conduct a structured literature review, or adjust the wording to clarify that data triangulation (i.e., incorporating different sources of information on the same topic) was used instead.

I recommend that you eliminate sentences 202–204: *"For this reason, we endeavored to include specific questions, eliminating those that were similar, avoiding questions that were too open-ended, and focusing on those that allowed for a relevant response to the topic of study."* In my opinion, this sentence does not add meaningful information.

Results:

Paragraph 259–262: Be cautious when stating that the games exhibit a "great diversity" of characters based on the descriptions in the text. If the race and ethnicity of the main characters are not specified, the claim may not be well-supported. Additionally, simply allowing players to choose between a male and female character does not constitute "great diversity" and fails to acknowledge non-binary identities. It would be more accurate to state that the games include *some* representation—for instance, by featuring a protagonist with a mobility impairment or including characters from different backgrounds. This is especially relevant given your statement in line 408: *"Few games consider multicultural and inclusivity aspects."*

Section 4.3.XXX: Ensure that it is clear to the reader that the points listed in the first paragraphs of each subchapter reflect the opinions of the experts rather than universally accepted facts. Additionally, improve readability by incorporating linking words.

Line 270: "Three out of six games" is not the majority.

Figure 2: It is unclear why Figure 2 stands alone rather than being included in one of the expert response tables. Please delete the figure and integrate the information into Table 3.

Tables 2 and 3: The table descriptions should be made more informative to better convey the content they present. Ideally, a table title should clearly state what the table contains while providing a brief summary of its contents. The column title "*Importance*" is ambiguous, as it suggests a qualitative measure rather than a numerical representation of expert agreement. A more precise title would be "*Expert Agreement (%)*" or "*Proportion of Experts (%)*." Additionally, consider whether Tables 2 and 3 could be combined to save space by presenting them side by side.

I also do not fully understand how you arrived at the response numbers in Tables 2 and 3, given that Table S9 appears to display all expert responses. For example, how did you determine that "*Character – Socializer*" received five responses and "*Character – Explorer*" received three when Table S9 suggests only two responses were recorded? Please clarify.

Discussion:

Thank you for restructuring this section; it is a significant improvement. However, this section still lacks clarity. Some parts focus too heavily on reiterating the research results rather than analyzing their implications and interpretations. The discussion should clearly summarize the key findings in relation to the research questions and critically reflect on them.

Additionally, the discussion lacks an in-depth comparison to existing research, which would strengthen your arguments. A few specific areas that could be expanded include:

- The debate over whether a catastrophic or non-alarmist tone is more effective is interesting but remains inconclusive. Rather than simply presenting both perspectives, consider providing insights into how game designers could balance these approaches effectively.
- While you discuss how serious games engage players, you could further explore whether they improve understanding of scientific concepts related to natural hazards. The mention of Bloom's Taxonomy is useful but could be expanded by specifying which cognitive skills these games enhance the most.
- The argument that excessive rewards can be distracting (Chou, 2015) is valid, but it would be helpful to include practical recommendations on how to structure rewards to enhance learning rather than just entertainment.
- You mention collective efficacy and community engagement but do not explore in depth how these elements could be effectively integrated into game mechanics. Providing concrete examples from existing games would strengthen this argument.

Conclusion:

This section would benefit from deeper reflections on what your research has achieved. The statement that the study provides "new insights" is somewhat vague—be more specific about what is novel in your findings compared to previous research.

While you acknowledge the limitations of qualitative analysis, it would be useful to suggest how future studies could address these limitations more concretely (e.g., through experimental studies to measure behavioral changes).

The recommendations for future research are relevant but somewhat broad. Instead of simply suggesting further studies on different game elements, propose specific research questions or methodologies that could build upon your findings.