

#Editor

Dear Authors,

I thank you for your careful revision, where you implemented the main changes suggested by both referees and I fully agree with Ref#1 comments on the utility of this kind of work, if possible focussing even more clearly on the process of managing large surveys with very different kinds of stake-holders, highlighting, as suggested by the referee, challenges and lessons (and also clarifying the resilience definition in agreement with the referee's comments).

Answer: We would like to thank the time editor and reviewer 1 have spent on this manuscript. It was a good contribution to increase the quality of the text. We have included all of the suggestions of this second review and we hope it is in enough quality to be published.

#Reviewer 1

Dear Authors,

The paper has improved significantly from the previous version. I believe that the main issues (unclear objective, structural unevenness, and conceptual confusion) were mostly addressed effectively. However, issues remain unsolved:

Answer: We would like to thank the time reviewer 1 has taken to evaluate this manuscript. All their comments helped to considerably improve the quality of the text.

1) The concept of resilience remains poorly defined. You state to be following a framework, yet you never clearly show it. From your statement in the section from lines 98 to 111 you clearly state that risk is a component of resilience. You also define risk as hazard * vuln * exposure. However, you do not exactly explain what are the components that you need to add to risk to turn it into resilience. I suggest making either a diagram or anyway a clear statement, where you define how you construct resilience. Hazard * Exposure * Vulnerability = Risk and Risk * ??? = Resilience. Additionally, in line 116 you talk about prioritizing indicators of resilience and vulnerability. However, from your definition vulnerability indicators are already part of resilience.

Answer: We appreciate the comment made by the reviewer. In lines 158 - 160 (clean version), we have included Eq. 1 to 3 to explicitly show how resilience is evaluated in terms of the risk evaluation and risk management assessment (which counts with the system capacities, in our study). We hope this eliminates any remaining confusion. Additionally, regarding the use of the term resilience indicators, we agree with the reviewer the wording could be improved, , we meant to express the indicators that

represent the actions used to increase system capacity, therefore, increasing resilience, however this could be better explained by just using “system capacity indicators” than “resilience indicators”. Therefore, we have changed the use of “resilience indicators” to “system capacity indicators” throughout the entire manuscript.

2) The lessons learned could come across more clearly. Instead, the various sections only focus on your process of creating a survey, the challenges you faced, and how you solved them. But you never state clearly in this phase the "challenges are 1,2,3 and you can solve them by doing X,Y,Z". The closest to this are the five points that you listed in the discussion, which I personally found to be the most useful part of the manuscript. I suggest either stating at the end of each section what the challenges and solutions are for each phase or making a summary paragraph or table where you state these challenges clearly. I believe that the reader of such a paper would be someone interested in creating a similar questionnaire, hence their main interest would be in finding a clearly stated set of phases to follow, challenges in each phase, and solutions to those challenges.

Answer: We agree with the reviewer's comment and we have included table 2 as a summary of challenges, lessons and suggestions found on building a global survey, in the beginning of section 4.

As main edits, I suggest reducing the more conceptual aspect of how you defined resilience and going straight to your working definition (for example, removing the paragraph where you discuss the evolution of DRM).

Answer: The authors agree with the comment of the reviewer, and have removed this paragraph.

Focus on the more general challenges that one could encounter in creating a similar questionnaire, even if they are not working on resilience itself but on something similarly complex. Present your lessons learned clearly in a table or summary paragraph, so that a reader who is making a survey can follow them easily.

Answer: We agree with the reviewer's comment and we have included table 2 as a summary of challenges, lessons and suggestions found on building a global survey, in the beginning of section 4.

Anyway, it was a great improvement from the previous version. Looking forward to your final version.

Answer: We would like to appreciate reviewer 1 very much!