

For example,  
the summary of the findings of the Rubbia et al 2015 paper based on a subset of the  
2011 competition was interesting and useful information. Outside this one year, any analysis of the drawings is anecdotal.

Interesting observation. I don't think it's correct to define anecdotal analysis. What I wrote is what can be seen in the drawings. Of course, children perception of widely debated topics could be conditioned and linked to stereotyped images and a certain trivialization of concepts. I added a comment on this aspect to the discussion.

What reported in the work, it is a summary of what emerged from the drawings, regardless of the large or less number of the analyzed drawings. Many subjects are often repeated, especially among students in the same courses. This also emerged regarding the cited Rubbia et al. The work was done as part of a specific project, that has recently been revived and which has a precise objective. We have increased the number of analyzed drawings, obtaining very similar results.

I would encourage the author to revise this manuscript in the following ways -  
• An introduction to the INGV, stating the purpose of its work and why it has a strong track record of dissemination. Why does it run museums and these competitions? What are the objectives of the dissemination, ie, how is it judged to be successful or not?

Above all, the number of involved schools.

As this it is not a work on the INGV dissemination activities, I prefer do not make heavy the text with dissertations on the objectives of dissemination.

• A more in depth rationale for the calendar project - clearly state the objectives for the project and how it has been evaluated to be successful. Is this merely numbers involved? Is there a greater body of literature that could be referenced here to frame the project in context?

I have reviewed the description and definition of the objectives of the project.  
I have not found specific literature on these issues.

• Make more use of the drawings and the analysis of them. A brief methodology in how drawings can be used to extract information on attitudes might be useful. For each year in the calendar provide more evidence, if available, of the analysis of the drawings and what that tells us about children's attitudes about the topic.

I don't quite understand what kind of other evaluations you suggest we should do.  
Probably, we need other competences to deeply analyze the children's attitude from the drawings.

• Finally, summarise general patterns emerging over the ten years. What research has emerged from it? Are there patterns that can be seen year on year, or have attitudes changed over time? How has the calendar projects helped achieve INGV's dissemination goals? What lessons are there to learn for others wanted to do similar? What is the contributions to the wider science communication body of research?

I added in the conclusions an impact analysis for INGV.

If the author is able to make these changes then this would be an interesting and useful article for the readers of Geoscience Communication.

Other comments:

The manuscript title does not reflect the paper well - Maybe something like "Summarising 10 years of the Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia's Calendar Competition."

Thanks for the advice, the title has been changed.

Some of the language throughout is unclear and would benefit from some editing.

The English of the manuscript has been revised.

Line 8 - The reader at this point does not know what INGV is - expand and provide a brief description here.

Done

Line 25 - Expand INGV.

Done

Lines 53-60 - The section is not relevant and the space could be better used to describe the objectives of the competition and how you will evaluate it.

Done

Figure 1 - if the faces of the children are supposed to be anonymised this is not very strong and the children could be easily recognised from the images. This could be a safeguarding issue.

Done

Line 229 - Who suggested the mission? Was it designed by the children or presented to the children?

Done

The author should provide a statement on the availability of the data from the project - is it possible to see a record of submitted drawings and/or analysis thereof?  
It would be of interest to see an ethics statement from the author about how they handled the submitted drawings as research data, although

The drawings have been sent only by the participating schools and the INGV have only interacted with the schools. In the calls there were information on data processing and form for authorization for publication, in compliance with the Italian and European law, and it was expressly indicated that the submitted materials will be keep in the INGV office in Rome and that it would be used by INGV for analysis and scientific reports.