Thank you authors for their consideration and revision of RR.

Problem statement: There are inconsistent findings regarding the effectiveness of learning when using comics compared to non-comic materials, namely texts.

Goal: (a) A systematic review of using comics in education, (b) meta-analysis to quantify the overall effect of empirical studies that used comics versus texts, and (c) explore whether comics affect learning differently when it comes to STEM compared to non-STEM fields.

Hypothesis: (i) If learning via comics operates in the same way as learning via non-comics material, namely texts, then, comics and texts will have the same impact on learning; (ii) if the combination of text and images confers greater communicability beyond learning via texts, then we hypothesise that comics will have a greater impact on learning.

I found the revised RR is more rigorous and thus looking forward to see the research findings from the authors in the future.

Some minor notes to add:

* Topkaya et al., 2023 is not included in the bibilograph despite being extensively referred to in the manuscript.
* I still believe that the authors could consider adding variables of interactive media in “13. Control condition (texts)”, such as games. This could include board games or game-like quizzes in the education setting, which I consider interesting aspects to also look into.
* In relation to “3. Location” and “4. Education field”, the authors could consider looking into the location’s pedagogical context and elaborate them in the report. For instance, how is STEM significant in the location’s pedagogical values and curriculums? How much autonomy is given to teaching professionals in terms of choosing their teaching materials in, let’s say, formal education? (i.e., were comics common in the learning environment in that location or is it something that is new and unconventional?)