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General comments The paper aims to describe the design and implementation of a new robust and portable network of instruments for remote sensing of volcanic SO$_2$ emissions. The authors show the good results of this network in a study case at Telica, Nicaragua. My concerns are listed in the following paragraphs. I believe that the paper deserves publication, after taking into account the remarks given below:

Specific comments Although in general the English is good, the manuscript must be revised. It appears some type errors that can be revised. Abstract In the abstract, authors do not present any conclusion about their results with the new instrumentation network. Rewrite the abstract explaining the most remarkable results of the campaigns. Sections In Section 2, the authors explain the main characteristics of the instrumentation and the calculation of the SO$_2$. From line 93 to 103, authors expose that “the chances of detecting and measuring a volcanic plume are determined by the meteorological conditions, particularly the wind direction. A typical installation would involve combining two or more instruments measuring simultaneously along the area corresponding to the predominant wind directions”. However, in line 102, they explain that the wind speed is obtained from wind speed models, such as the GFS 102 from the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Does it mean that the new instrumentation does not include any instrument to measure the wind speed, but however the wind direction is derived? Please, clarify it. References Some of the references included in the manuscript require pag. numbers.