Response to the first review

We thank the reviewer for the appreciation of our work and for the useful suggestions provided that improve the original manuscript.
We followed all the recommendations and modified the manuscript accordingly. In particular, we added all the references suggested by the reviewer and introduced some more where requested.
We provided some information on Italian schools curricula and emphasized the role of kids in bringing crucial information to their families.
We also introduced all the technical corrections proposed by the reviewer.

Response to Sam Illingworth's review

We thank the reviewer for his kind opinion about our work and for the useful suggestions provided. Below we address in italic each of the points he made, and highlight where the original text has been changed.

- The abstract is on the whole excellent. However, please consider the overuse of the word 'interesting' which appears quite a lot over the course of only a few sentences.

Touché. The word interesting is just so easy to use. We just got rid of it. Most of the times.

- The biggest issue that needs to be addressed with this study is one of ethics. What ethical clearance did this study receive? How did the participants give their informed consent to participate in this study (this is especially important as they are a potentially vulnerable audience)? What safeguarding and other issues arose? And how were these mitigated by the research team. See Section 4.1 of Archer (2021) or Section 2.2 of Mohadjer (2021) for examples of how you might best include this in your manuscript.

This is a good point. As mentioned in the manuscript, The Imaginary Eruption workshop was carried out within the framework of the Edurisk Project, proposed to all Italian schools. The participation of each school into the project follows an official procedure that also ensures ethical clearance. We added a few lines of text to better emphasize this important aspect.

- It was not entirely clear how you moved from the frequency of words (Section 4.1) to the framing of these occurrences (Section 4.2). Could you please include more detail about how this was done and what method was adopted, as at the moment it would be difficult for an independent researcher to repeat your findings, or even for a new researcher to adopt this work for their own study.

The analysis carried out in Section 4.1 only accounts for the written part of the stories, and considers all text, written by all students in all frames, all together as a single dataset from which frequencies are considered. In the following chapter 4.2, the analysis considers the collection of stories that are analyzed and compared, frame by frame. We added a few sentences to clarify that.

- I wonder if Section 4.3 on Stromboli could be removed entirely, as it does not add anything significantly to the study, and as you point out yourselves is much less developed than the work in the other 10 school districts.

We cannot deny that Section 4.3 does not present results as detailed as those obtained in the Neapolitan area. Nevertheless, these few kids did witness a real explosive eruption. We consider this a valuable addition to the overall picture and would prefer to maintain the Section.

- The Conclusions are overly long and could could benefit from both a streamlining and also a reframing around recommendations and/or advise for others wanting to adapt /build on this approach

We modified the Conclusions to make them easier to read. We hope we succeeded..

- For the most part this is a very well-written proposal, but there are several technical corrections that need to be addressed. I picked up all the same ones as Reviewer 1, and so will not repeat them here. A final close proofread and edit after all these changes have been made would also be appreciated.

We introduced all the suggestions provided by Reviewer #1, and carefully checked the revised manuscript. Hopefully, we could capture most of the errors.