

Authors' responses to review comments are in *red, bold, italics*.

**Referee #2 Pei-Lin Yu**

Received and published: 12 September 2019

1. Initial paragraph or section evaluating the overall quality of the discussion paper ("general comments").

Scientific Significance: The manuscript represents a substantial contribution to the understanding of natural hazards and their consequences through the use of the network analysis called Fuzzy Cognitive Mapping.

Scientific Quality: The scientific and/or technical approaches and the applied methods are largely valid in my judgment, although I am not a network analyst. The authors seem to 'lump' two very different communities together for comparative purposes; would benefit from describing the cultural/ethnic/socioeconomic makeup of the focus groups sampled. In addition, the importance of linguistic and cultural variability in understanding of terms such as climate change should be clearly addressed.

Presentation Quality: The scientific data, results and conclusions are presented in a clear, concise, and well-structured way.

*Authors sincerely thank the referee for the review, constructive comments and positive feedback. Suggested improvements are much appreciated and they have been addressed below.*

2. Individual scientific questions/issues ("specific comments").

P. 2 Lines 10-15. Consider updating this introduction with urgency of environmental degradation such as the recent megafires in Amazon.

*Good suggestion. Agreed and included (Pg. 2: lines 6-7)*

P. 4 line 4, worth mentioning that Brazilian governance structure demonstrates the volatility of politics in Amazonian countries, and the relative disengagement of the larger global community. This could also be discussed briefly on p. 14, line 15-16.

*Thank you. We have added a sentence about it in the introduction (Pg. 2: lines 5-6) because we think that it is in fact very important, but applicable to all the Amazonian countries, not only Brazil. In addition, we believe this has already been touched upon within the discussion (Pg 14, line 35-Pg 15 line 2).*

P. 5 Line 10. What is the cultural background/ethnicity of these ribeirinhos? Seems that these communities in Bolivia and Brazil would likely have some important differences.

*Thanks for highlighting this. We were instructed to reduce the content concerning the communities by a previous reviewer. However, as suggested, we have clarified the background of the 'ribeirinhos' in Pg. 4, lines 16-17, in Section 2 'Description of the study area', and included relevant information in Pg. 4: lines 10-12 and line 24 .*

*The studied communities (Guarayos in Bolivia and Ribeirinhos in Brazil) are culturally different, but their conditions are largely similar. Both live at the edge of the agricultural frontier, are reliant upon natural resources for incomes, face high levels of poverty, and are increasingly threatened by outside forces. The differences perceptions of the present situation in Guarayos and in Tapajos are already included in the different FCMs developed during the workshops (Figures 4 and 5).*

P. 12 Lines 10-15. With regard to climate change it's possible that there are cultural, linguistic, inter-group, or even individual differences in perceptions of the meaning of the term 'climate change'. Please address this.

*Agreed. We have included this caveat in the text. "This finding may also reflect the distinct cultural and linguistic meaning or representations of climate changes (e.g drought, flooding) across the two sites." (Pg 13: lines 9-10).*

*However, we should point out that the FCMs are group maps and therefore 'agreed' or 'consensual' maps developed during the workshops. Discussions between stakeholders were carefully guided by a facilitator, who helped to reach consensus. These types of exercises are not meant to identify (individual) contrasting views, to do so it is better to develop individual FCMs or other methodologies. Also, as part of the FCM methodology (Pg 5) a number of components considered to be representing similar features were merged. Therefore, components like reduced rains or increased droughts are included under this catch-all phrase of climate change. We agree that the need for highlighting linguistic and cultural distinctions is definitely relevant, but we don't believe it will have greatly affected the results here.*

P. 13-14. In discussion mentions unanticipated results for climate change which reinforces my comment above. In my experience conducting climate change oriented interviews with indigenous gardeners of the sub-tropics, interviewees stated clearly that climate change is not relevant because 'the weather is always changing'. Thus it's worth asking if concepts of climate change amongst Western scientists might not apply to traditional communities.

*Interesting point. We completely agree that cultural perspectives will have a considerable impact on perceptions of concepts like climate change. However, it does not apply to our study. As is common with the Fuzzy Cognitive Mapping method, similar components are grouped together. The stakeholders in both Brazil and Bolivia mentioned an array of terms (e.g. increasing drought, reduced rains, increasing floods, weather instability), but they decided during the workshops to use the word 'climate change' to catch all terms. Further, in follow up meetings (Varela-Ortega et al., 2014) stakeholders validated this combination as being accurate to the current situation.*

3. Compact listing of purely technical corrections at the very end ("technical corrections": typing errors, etc.). Not included.

Table 3 has misspelling 'focusses'

*The manuscript has been written in British English, making this spelling appropriate.*

P. 14 Section heading: I think it should read "Effecting Change..."

*Thank you, we have change the word ‘affecting’ by ‘encouraging’ . Section heading 5.2 in Pg. 13.*