

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