

GC2025-1235

Although the reviewers have diligently highlighted the limitations of the current study, the authors have already indicated their willingness to make the necessary revisions. However, I would like to gently emphasise a few important points for consideration.

As previously indicated by the initial two reviewers and corroborated by the third reviewer, the paper must undergo a comprehensive reorganisation to mitigate any potential confusion or misunderstanding. Specifically, it is crucial to clearly delineate, in the early portion of the methodology section, the number of participants involved in all phases, with particular emphasis on Group A, Group B, and the pre- and post-video stages. This clarification can be effectively achieved by revising Fig. 2. Alternatively, a summary table may be incorporated following Fig. 2, which would specify the total number of participants, as already detailed in Tables 1 and 3.

Given that some terminology originates from the social sciences, we recommend providing explanations of how these terms are used. This is particularly important as we are publishing in a journal focused on geoscience communication, and the potential readership may encompass individuals from various academic disciplines.

To address ethical considerations, authors may include an ethical statement in their manuscript, as outlined in the guidelines for contributors available at <https://www.geoscience-communication.net/submission.html>. For further guidance on structuring this section, authors are encouraged to consult the editorial found at <https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/4/493/2021/>, which also provides insights on organizing a research paper.

Given that the study presents certain limitations, as identified not only by the reviewers but also by the authors themselves, for instance, in L580 (where it is noted that, although the study initially aimed to target the general public, the participant profile is restricted to a highly educated, nature-loving, and young segment of the population), it would be prudent to include a dedicated paragraph discussing these limitations. This section should also address the extent to which these limitations may impact the results and propose directions for future research to address these issues.

In response to Reviewer #2's comments on the video content, please provide a more detailed clarification of paragraph 1.6 (Aims of the study) in accordance with your response to Reviewer #2.

Following rev. #3, consider the possibility of summarizing the results using graphs and tables for clarity.