

The manuscript has substantially benefited from the revision, particularly from the reformulation of several paragraphs and the overall reorganization of the text. The structure is now clearer, and the paper's topic is presented in a more coherent and effective manner. This scoping review remains an interesting and valuable approach. Although, by its nature and as acknowledged by the authors, it does not aim to provide an exhaustive assessment of the broader volcanic hazard and risk communication literature, it offers useful insights into studies on volcanic hazard and risk communication.

Overall, I consider the revised manuscript a useful contribution for researchers interested in volcanic hazards and risk communication, particularly in the distinctive and still comparatively underexplored context of communication during periods of volcanic quiescence.

I suggest, however, reconsidering the position of the three tables. Each table should preferably be positioned at the end of the paragraph in which it is first introduced, with an explicit reference to the table added where appropriate, or immediately after the opening sentence of the relevant paragraph, before the discussion of the specific papers included in the table: i.e. Table 1 at Line 220 after “effectiveness”; Table 2 at line the end of 3.2 Approaches paragraph; Table 3 at Line 458 after “geoparks”. This would improve the flow of the text and make it easier for readers to consult the summarized literature while following the discussion.

In **REFERENCES** Todesco et al 2022a 2022b are the same papers. Please replace the latter with the paper in Table 2 : Todesco, M. De Lucia, M., Bagnato, E., Behncke, B., Bonforte, A, De Astis, G., Giammanco, S., Grassa, F., Neri, M, Scarlato, P. & Neri, A. (2022). Eruptions and social media Communication and public outreach about volcanoes and volcanic activity in Italy. *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 10, Article 926155. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2022.926155>. **Please check this reference in the text**

Finally, I recommend a careful reading of the manuscript, as a few minor typographical and editorial errors still appear to be present.