Thank you for the opportunity to read your work. For the most part I found this to be a well-presented account of the Living Labs that have been developed at Keele University, which was well structured and engaged with the appropriate literature.

However, at the moment I do not feel that this manuscript is ready for publication in Geoscience Communication. The main reason for this is that the work that is presented here is very descriptive. There is little formal reflection, and it is also unclear what the ‘success’ or impact of the programme of activities has had on both the student and the staff that have been involved in these labs to date. As such, while it is interesting to read about these initiatives, it is unclear how they are advancing the field, and also how (and why) others might adopt such an approach at their own institutions.

I would strongly encourage the authors to revisit this work and to conduct a detailed study with the students and staff that were involved in these programmes to assess their feedback and evaluate the impact of the Living Labs. The results of these surveys could then be used to contextualise the impact that these Living Labs are having and would also help to move the findings of the current work from beyond anecdotal evidence to something more formalised. The results from such a survey (or focus group or series of interviews) could also be used to frame the labs and to present a series of recommendations for the development of future activities at both Keele University and beyond.

I hope that these comments are not too disheartening, as it is really interesting to hear about the work that is being done in these Living Labs. With further reflection, evidence, and framing I believe that this work will be of great value to the wider Geoscience Communication community.