Response to Referee 1 on ESSD-2024-363

We would like to again thank Reviewer 1 for their thoughtful and thorough follow-up. We also appreciate the graciousness of Reviewer 1's evaluation scores, which are very encouraging.

Below we address each point raised:

**Technical corrections:**

**Point 1:** GSI is mentioned in Table 1 and Figure 2, before explanation of the abbreviation in the text on page 5. Please either use the full name, or mention earlier in the text.

Noted. This has been amended.

**Point 2:** In some cases in the text, the reference to earlier figures or tables is rather more confusing than that it helps understand. Reconsider if (1) the figure/table reference really supports the point you make in the text and (2) the point you make in the text needs a figure/table as reference. For example, but not limited to, L186-L191 references to Figure 4 / Table 2. This could for example be changed to ": Through our open web API, we collected voluntary requests for correction, each submission requiring photographic evidence. Each building for which a correction was submitted was given a new validated damage class (Table 5) with the new classification provided that the submitted evidence conformed to *our binary damage classification*."

Very poignant – in hindsight I see what the reviewer is referring to. I have tried to follow the example to remove references that would suggest the reader's attention to jump to a previous figure or table and disrupt the reading process.

A few notable exceptions – I have refrained from removing section references, as I feel that section references are more of an acknowledgement that something is discussed later, or had been discussed above, and less of a suggestion that the reader follow through with reading the section before coming back.

In the data availability section, there is a reference to Table 5. While I acknowledge that this is similarly disruptive, I am of the opinion that this specific reference is less negotiable.

In the conclusion there are references to Figure 10 and Figure 11. I think these are somewhat necessary references to drive the points made in the conclusion.

**Point 3:** Capitalization of lists is inconsistent. L121-L131 for example. L301-L309 are capitalized, L375-379 are not

Noted. This has been amended.