

We would like to sincerely thank the Editor and the Reviewers for their thorough and constructive comments. We have addressed all points as carefully as possible and provide below our point-by-point responses (with the authors' replies highlighted in red).

REVIEWER 1

The paper presents a project regarding geological dissemination in a geopark by engaging the local population to suggest tales later write in a book. Each tale is linked to a geosite; both, tales and geosites, are connected along a geotouristic trail that explores some of the geological evolutionary stages of the crossed area, as depicted through the tales and some artistic pictures (in the supplement booklet).

I read with interest the work, enjoying the booklet, that unfortunately at the moment it is only written in Italian. This could be a limit to the interest of the work, given that the methodology and the aim are well explained but one of the the products (the booklet) can be well appreciated almost exclusively by those who read Italian.

I have only a few small suggestions for the Authors that can be read along the attached commented file.

About the figures, I suggest to enlarge at the maximum size of the page all maps and to delete the figure 7, adding some information to the figure 2.

We would like to thank the Reviewer for the careful and insightful review, as well as for the PDF containing detailed comments. All suggested edits made directly in the manuscript have been incorporated. We have removed Figure 7 and, as recommended, added specific elements to Figure 2 (which is now Figure 3 in the revised manuscript). Finally, we have updated the maps in the text, enlarging them as suggested, and we agree that they are now much more readable for the reader.

REVIEWER 2

The manuscript references indigenous knowledge. However, the Walser people are not generally considered an indigenous people, so this wording is incorrect and in the worst case, offensive to indigenous groups. Consider changing the wording to 'local knowledge' or 'locally rooted knowledge', or give a well-informed justification for the use of 'indigenous storytelling'.

Thank you for this important observation. We fully agree, and it was certainly not our intention to use terminology that could be inappropriate or offensive. We originally adopted the expression 'indigenous storytelling' because it appears in some strands of the literature; however, the Reviewer is right that the Walser are not an indigenous people, but rather a community of settlers who historically established themselves in Alagna. For this reason, we have accepted the suggestion and revised the terminology accordingly, replacing it with the recommended wording

The geological and methodological research is well done, though its description would benefit from a thorough editing process. Some sections are unnecessarily lengthy, and the English has wording that is out of place in the context and/or grammatically wrong. A thorough edit by a native speaker would be required before publishing.

We thank the Reviewer for this remark. Following the suggestion, we have carefully revised the English throughout the manuscript, shortening several sections and improving the clarity of the geological and methodological descriptions. We think these edits make the text more concise and easier to follow.

Especially section 3 would benefit from condensing and a clear distinction between the objectives, the design of the interviews, the outcomes of the interviews and the design of the geotrail. The artistic collaboration description would benefit from figures and a condensation of the description.

We appreciate the Reviewer's helpful suggestion. We have substantially revised and condensed Section 3. We agree that the objectives were not clearly expressed and were too dispersed throughout the text. While we have not changed the subsection titles, we have reorganized the content as recommended to provide a clearer distinction between the objectives, the interview design, the interview outcomes, and the design of the geotrail. We believe this restructuring makes the section much clearer and more coherent

The study would benefit from outlining a quantifying approach to see the effectiveness of the booklet. Especially if the project is intended to be scaled, designing a tool for feedback and engagement metrics would be essential to ensure its optimal use. The questionnaires referenced in section 5 are very vague.

We fully agree. In the final part of the revised manuscript, we have clarified this aspect and expanded on possible approaches to see the effectiveness of the booklet. While we do not go into excessive detail, since these elements fall under future work and are beyond the scope of the present article, we think the added explanations address this valuable remark.

There is a constant switch between passive voice (see e.g. section 3.1) and active voice (see e.g. section 3.2 from L168: "We took...") Please choose one and remain consistent. Same goes for present and past tense, see e.g. switch in L223 and L224

We thank the Reviewer for this comment. We have revised the manuscript to ensure consistency in voice and tense, converting the relevant passages into active voice throughout.

'Citizen science' is addressed in the introduction but then never again. This project is only in part an example of citizen science, and if the authors want to emphasize that aspect, a more thorough explanation of this is necessary. Alternatively, the reference to citizen science (see L56) could be removed.

We thank the Reviewer for this precise remark. Indeed, the project relied more on a participatory, co-creation approach rather than on a citizen-science framework. For this reason, we have removed the reference to citizen science indicated by the Reviewer, while retaining and clarifying the relevant passages that focus on co-creation, which are central to our work

It is unclear how the final project (the booklet) will be presented. Will it be printed and distributed for free? Will it be available as an app, and where will the information about it be available? Will it be translated, so that it is accessible for more tourists than those who speak Italian? Clarity on the practicalities would be an asset

We thank the Reviewer for this helpful comment. We have added a short paragraph clarifying how the distribution of the booklet has been planned, including its format and availability (L355–361).

Finally, all of the Reviewer's specific remarks have been addressed and incorporated into the revised manuscript. In particular, we have added an overview map of the Alagna Valsesia municipality (new Figure 2) and revised the wording at several points as suggested. Furthermore, the booklet has been translated into English and included as supplementary material, as requested by both Reviewers. We sincerely thank the Reviewers for these comments, which have greatly contributed to improving the clarity and scientific quality of our manuscript