Response to Editor  
  
Editor: Humphreys, Madeleine  
Comments to the Author:  
Dear Charlotte  
  
I have now received three reviews on your manuscript. The reviewers have quite divergent opinions, but overall, significant changes are required before this manuscript could be considered for publication in Journal of Petrology. In particular, the reviewers’ comments, taken together, indicate a need for significant expansion of the manuscript. I am therefore recommending major revisions, but request that you resubmit in the longer (standard) Journal of Petrology article format with a significantly expanded critical discussion. In particular, it is important to deepen the discussion of how this approach can be extended to other systems where there is much less supporting information than for Kilauea, or where different kinds of samples are available. This is important because it makes the wider application of a ‘rapid response’ method more problematic and harder to justify. Reviewers 1 and 3 give clear suggestions on how to address this. Please also note Reviewer 1 and 3’s general comments about the way that you frame the novelty and impact of your results. They also indicate that the manuscript would benefit from citing a wider body of literature.  
  
Regards  
  
Madeleine