

RC3: AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS COMMENTS

nhess-2023-142: "Between global risk reduction goals, scientific-technical capabilities and local realities: a novel modular approach for multi-risk assessment" by Schoepfer et al.

- Authors' response to the Reviewer#1 comments

Line numbers refer to the track change version (nhess-2023-142-manuscript-version4_ATC.pdf).

Anonymous Referee #1, RC3: 'Comment on nhess-2023-142'

I thank the authors for their further efforts to respond to my comments, and I believe they have largely addressed my remaining concerns. I have just two outstanding minor suggestions:

1. In the caption of Table 2, you should make it clear that the stakeholders shown in the table for each group are representative of the Peruvian context, which is the study area to be discussed later in the manuscript. (Otherwise, I think the reader might be confused as to why there is a sudden focus on Peru).

[Thank you for your feedback and suggestion. In order to be more precise, we have modified the caption and have now integrated "Peruvian Stakeholders" in the second column in addition.](#)

2. As I mentioned in the previous review, the conditional probabilities of hazards are somehow being accounted for given that the tsunami and the earthquake are not simulated independently (i.e., the same fault parameters are used for both, and the size of the tsunami is related to the magnitude of the earthquake). So, I suggest removing the sentence about conditional probabilities not being accounted for (line 240 of the current manuscript).

[We have removed the sentence as suggested \(line 225\).](#)

Please note that I also noticed the Jimenez et al. (2013) paper is missing from the reference section.

[Thank you for pointing this out, we have now added Jimenez et al. \(2013\) in the reference section.](#)