
Response to Editor**Manuscript:** <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2022-15>**Response date:** 24-April-2023

Dear Scott and coauthors,

Thank you for engaging so thoroughly in the review process. Based on the reviewers' comments and on your responses I suggest minor revisions. Please revise your manuscript based on your responses to the reviewers.

A few additional comments:

While I recognize that splitting your manuscript in two is not possible due to lack of enough content, I agree with both reviewers that the volcano portal section and the results based on the small subset of feedback (10 responses and only from developing nations) is not a good fit for this manuscript. Please consider removing it from the main text.

I also suggest combining table 1 and figure 2 (as suggested by one of the reviewers) as it will improve its readability. For the revised figure, you may consider choosing, coherence, warped and unwrapped versions of the same interferogram as opposed to using different examples to drive your points and eliminate unnecessary details from the images you used in figure 2.

And finally, the work of Gill et al. (2021) on recommended actions for integration of natural hazard data into DRR work might be a useful read to include in your section 4 or 5:
<https://nhess.copernicus.org/articles/21/187/2021/>

I look forward to reviewing your revised manuscript.

All the best,
Solmaz Mohadjer

Dear Solmaz Mohadjer,

Thank you for your additional comments on our manuscript.

- Following the reviews and after discussion with coauthors, we decided that we strongly wanted to retain the volcano portal sections in the text, so we substantially reworked and streamlined these sections and believed it was now much better aligned with the rest of the manuscript. However, we understand the issue with the small amount of feedback gathered so far. We believe that the volcano portal is a valuable communication tool and therefore discussion point

in the paper that complements the other portals discussed, would be of interest to the article readers, and is relevant to the high Twitter activity we observed during volcanic events. With this in mind, we have retained the volcano sections at reduced length and moved the corresponding Table 2 (*Barriers to uptake of satellite data identified by volcano observatories. Information is summarised from the responses from a range of official development assistance countries to a 2017 survey*) from the main text to the supplement. We have also moved the description of the survey from section 2.4 to the supplement.

- We have revised Figure 2 to combine with the previous Table 1 as suggested by the reviewer and yourself. This now forms a landscape figure.
- Thank you for highlighting the work of Gill et al. (2021), which we now refer to in Sections 4.2.3 and 4.3.

We have uploaded the revised manuscript with tracked changes.

Sincerely,

C. Scott Watson (on behalf of all co-authors)
