

## **Author's Response to the Editor Comments**

We would like to thank you for another round of very useful comments, which we have taken seriously and resulted in a major revision in the format of the article. Please find below a point-by-point response to the comments provided.

Comment 1: The manuscript still requires reorganisation to enhance its clarity and coherence.

Answer 1: We have reorganised the structure of the article to enhance clarity and coherence, which will be explained further below. In particular, we have tightened the focus of the study and reduced its length to deliver the key findings of the study more efficiently and effectively, with as little repetition as possible. Also, we have added some tables and contents to make sure that the paper can be understood without watching the videos that were used in the study.

Comment 2: Lines 430–560, which detail the video production process, should not be included in the Results section if the study's objective is to assess the video's potential to enhance knowledge, as outlined in Section 1, Aims of the Study. Phase 1, being a preparatory phase, should be presented earlier in the manuscript, ideally integrated with 3.1. It is advisable to merge the contents of these two paragraphs.

Answer 2: We have moved the video production process and the focus group discussion element of the article to the methodology section, and the latter was reduced significantly, with its details moved to Supplement i. Thank you so much for this advice, as it helped reduce repetition in the study.

Comment 3: Additionally, the manuscript contains an excessive number of sub-paragraphs, leading to confusion.

Answer 3: We reduced the number of sub-paragraphs and sections, only using up until the second degree of subsection (e.g. 1.2 or 5.3). Thank you for making this important point to make the structure of the article clearer and more reader friendly.

Comment 4: Numerous topics are redundantly addressed throughout the manuscript.

Answer 4: By restructuring the paper and separating the results section and the discussion section, we have made sure to reduce the number of redundantly addressed topic in the manuscript.

Comment 5: It is recommended to organise the manuscript as follows: 1) Introduction, including references to existing literature on geoheritage, the significance of geoheritage culture, and geoheritage and geoscience communication; 2) Description of the research site;

3) Aims of the Study; 4) Methodology; 5) Results and Discussion; 6) Limitations of the Study; 7) Ethical Statement; and 8) Conclusion.

Answer 5: We have reorganised the manuscript as follows 1) Introduction; 2) Regional setting; 3) Aim of the study; 4) Methodology; 5) Results; 6) Discussion; 7) Limitations of the Study and Future Directions; 8) Ethical Statement; and 8) Conclusion. I believe this structure allowed us to make the paper much more concise and easier to follow. Thank you very much for the valuable suggestion.