

I thank the authors for their detailed reply and commend their substantial revisions to the paper which make it much clearer. The new figures and tables really help to break things down. This paper will be an excellent addition to the literature.

I have a few further minor comments - these are mainly suggestions to add in a few additional sentences to help with clarity, plus a few minor typos. The main point that should be addressed is that in the results section, some of the paragraphs read a bit like a 'telephone directory' approach to a literature review - basically describing a set of papers sorted into themes - several paragraphs here could do with a final sentence or two to tell us what that set of papers collectively tell us. This will not require any re-analysis or significant time.

Comments:

It is unclear why articles that discussed no hazards and no interaction mechanisms were still included within the scope of the study. A sentence in section 3.1.2 or the methods to give an indication of what types of article this encompasses would be helpful.

Line 314 you set up the argument that the 'design and application of indicators varied' and then go on to describe a range of indicators. This paragraph could do with a final sentence to come back to the argument about the design/application based on what you have described - e.g., why does this matter or what do we now know from your synthesis of these studies?

Generally throughout section 3.2.2, each paragraph could do with a final sentence of summary or synthesis. At present, the structure of the paragraphs is an opening signposting sentence indicating the theme of the indicators you are looking at, followed by a descriptive list of a range of papers. It doesn't come across very clearly what these examples collectively show, or what the insight is from your analysis.

Bullet point starting on line 420 feels like it slightly contradicts your findings that 51% of the articles account for interactions between hazards (I was surprised it was this high!). This also appears in conclusions on line 528. Consider adding another sentence around line 420 to be more specific about what you think is missing from these studies.

Bullet points starting on line 420, it would be helpful to refer back to either sections of your findings or figures to help tie this together (just by section/figure number in brackets). I say this as the fourth and fifth bullet points are interesting but I don't think came across particularly clearly in your results. You might want to think about this with regards to my comment above that some of the paragraphs could do with a final sentence to synthesise/reflect and more explicitly make statements related to terminology and stakeholder engagement.

Writing on lines 461 - 466 feels more like results (and then if moved to results, possibly would answer my point above about the key finding of lack of stakeholder engagement not being that clear in the results section).

Sentence on line 478 about EU funded projects - would be nice to reference a few of these projects or calls

Recommendation 3 in section 4.2 did not come through very clearly in the results or discussion. Consider how you could bring this through more clearly in the results section (or if it is already there, perhaps refer to the section it appears in).

Line 133 - typo 'section 33'

Line 238 need a space after studies, line 301 need a space after study

Line 303 figure number is missing