

*Review of 'Science, art, and legends in geotourism: A multidisciplinary geotrail approach in Alagna Valsesia, Sesia Val Grande Geopark (NW Italy)' by Guerini et al.*

The study presents a multidisciplinary, co-creative methodology for developing a geotrail in the Sesia Val Grande UNESCO Global Geopark in NW Italy. It blends geological education, local Walser culture and artistic reinterpretation into a geoscience communication tool - a booklet-style "artist's book." Through a process of scientific mapping, community engagement via unstructured interviews, and artistic reinterpretation of oral traditions, the authors aim to provide a novel, emotionally resonant, and scientifically accurate geotourism experience.

I recommend the publication of the manuscript after major revisions, and look forward to seeing this published in due time.

General Comments:

1. The motivation and idea behind the booklet are novel and interesting. The foremost benefit is the integration of various relevant communities, making it a project that is both inclusive and well-rounded in its sources.
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'.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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
7. '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.

8. 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

Specific comments:

L27: remove 'in' after 'serve as a tool'

L54: define co-creation for the reader, as it is a central concept to the paper

L 76: designation is the wrong word here. Edit sentence removing 'research question' as no actual question is posed

L 91: make into 2 sentences – too convoluted as is

L117: confusing. Consider changing into '...mostly on easy hiking trails ranging from 1,200 to 2,450 meters above sea level, with a total elevation gain of 1,700 meters...'

Figure 1: while a beautiful image, a map locating the area would be more beneficial. Perhaps integrated with this image

Section 3: change to "method"

Section 3.1 'designation' is not the correct word. Change also in caption for Fig. 2

L171: 'think to a strategy' is incorrect. Suggest revising to 'develop a strategy'

L201: remove 'such as time', it is redundant

L212: DC needs to be better defined and/or requires a reference to a website or project description

L221 'residences'

L235-240. 'a guide who' would refer to a person, which is not the intention, I believe. Convoluted language, please clarify and be transparent in what tool this refers to

L243: 'malleable apparatus' is overly abstract. Suggest revising to e.g. 'flexible framework'

L258: revise to avoid double use of 'final'

L371: *the* geotrail