

Editor comments on revised manuscript

Thank you for the revisions you have made in answer to the comments from three reviewers and myself (editor).

The readability of the paper has greatly improved and, consequently, the insights we can extract from the paper have been enhanced. It was a pleasure to read.

Thank you for the amending Figures 1 and 2. The additions have made the iteration process clearer and more informative.

Thank you for adding a reflection on the limitations of the process. It makes the study more comprehensive and proposes improvements and a direction for future work.

Thank you for incorporating Table 2 and Table 3 with an overview of the audience feedback. This was very insightful to read.

Please find below three minor revisions and a list of minor technical comments:

1. All headings after 3.1 should be renumbered. For example, the section heading jumps from “3.1” to “3.4.1” (line 177), while it should be “3.1.1”? Please do the same for the remaining headings (eg. lines 238, 272...).
2. Line 225-226: no need to capitalize the names of the elements. Please rectify this in the rest of the manuscript.
3. Your comparison between knowledge gained by individuals versus groups was very interesting. You did not include this information in the Methods, however, nor that participants worked either in groups or alone, until lines 355 and then 495. Please include a mention of this in section **2.3. Participation and recruitment** (from line 130). It would be good to clarify if, when you refer to “participants” and give a certain N-value, you are referring to a group who may have given a single group answer or if a group worked together but each individual participant answered independently. Also to clarify the methods, eg. if you tagged participant IDs as a member of a group or individual (and if groups formed during the activity or arrived as groups of acquaintances?) (lines 144-146).

Technical comments:

1. Please check the format of your headings. For example, line 130: the final period from: “2.3. Participation” should be removed. It should be “2.3 Participation”.

This is done correctly in all the section headings prior, but not for the headings from this point onwards. Please make consistent throughout manuscript.

2. Line 124-125: missing article, “the creation”, in: “Expert geoscientists were also consulted in creation of...”
3. Line 131-132: Please add the word “sampling” in: “Convenience and snowballing were the primary methods used”.
4. Line 109-110: please keep the verb-tense (past tense) consistent: “we use existing festivals...”
5. Line 140-141: The parameters constrained the availability, not the need of participants. Consider rewording to “participants available per phase” in: “the above parameters significantly constrained the number of participants needed per phase...”.
6. Line 144: consider adding reference to Fig. 1 at the end of this sentence.
7. Line 149: remove comma before verb, in: “...agricultural), allows...”
8. Line 220: please define “solar PV” as solar photovoltaic.
9. Line 230: please change “wind” to “wind energy”.
10. Line 264: remove second “any” in: “without any clear any sub-themes”.
11. Line 281: add article “the” in: “how to continue PE toolkit development”.
12. Line 285: consider “evaluation phase” or “PE evaluation” to rephrase the line: “and the evaluation was iterated to be shorter...”
13. Line 333: consider arranging the references in chronological order
14. Line 409: Should you perhaps refer to Fig. A3 in this sentence, as it shows what the objects are (eg. aluminium ore, battery, etc).
15. Line 444: correct spelling of intervention in: “invention groups”.
16. Line 451: please italicise the “t” in t-test.
17. Line 515: Please remove the semicolon in: “festivals; to test how...”
18. Line 582: Please remove comma in: “(budget-dependent), might include”.
19. Line 651-652: consider adding the words “energy systems” to: “both wind and solar need...”.
20. Given that you mention “festival-linked time limitations and observed disruption of engagement flow” (line 382), it may be interesting to add a line or two with your assessment of why you consider festivals as a recommended setting for informal education despite this observation (e.g. in the Discussion section, lines 515-520).

Tables

21. Table 1: Please make text left-indented.
22. Table 2: First column, remove extra space in: “Preferred learning methods”.

23. Table 2: Please consider adding sample size (N = 32) to: “Response rate 69%”. (same for Table 3).
24. Table 2: Please define “Anchor answers”. As I understood, anchor answers are examples of answers provided by participants?
25. Table 4: please use lowercase for words in the table, as you have in the other tables.

Figures

26. Figure 1: Caption could be rephrased to differentiate Figures 1 from 2. Figure 1 presents the settings and specifications of the festivals. Figure 2. Describes, indeed, the iteration process.
27. I would separate the first references to Figs 1 and 2 in the first mention (Lines 108-109), for example:
“Our process of iterative phases (~~Fig. 1; Fig. 2~~) highlights the systematic approach to developing a PE toolkit for the festival setting (~~Fig 1~~), in which each iteration across the three phases; builds on the previous one until a final PE toolkit is developed (~~Fig 2~~).”
28. Fig 1: Include what % of N=39 is in Control vs Intervention group.
29. Figure 5: please define “EA” in the caption.
30. Figures A1 and A4: please define “CRM”.
31. Figure A2: please add space between number and unit in: “3cm³”.