

## #Editor

Dear Authors,

the revised version is much improved, having changed the focus as suggested, and it is almost ready for publication: the Referee suggests a few final changes that will increase the readability and clarity of your work.

**Answer:** We would like to thank the time editor and reviewer 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 third review and we hope it is in enough quality to be published.

## #Reviewer 1

Dear Authors,

the quality of the work has improved significantly from the last round of edits. I believe that by focussing more on the lessons learned from the survey and less on the theory behind resilience the work is more able to service the desired audience. However, I believe that some small edits are still required before publication:

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

First, the equation representing your conceptualization of resilience (Eq.1 - line 160) seems to be incorrect. In the current version, resilience is inversely proportional to risk management, meaning that increased risk management would mean a decrease in resilience. While it is directly proportional to risk, meaning that higher risk means higher resilience. Still, since this equation is the author's own creation, I might be wrong in interpreting it. Feel free to correct me in case.

**Answer:** We appreciate the comment made by the reviewer, because it was actually a mistake when writing it, the resilience value that we adopted in our work is actually equal risk management / risk. This was corrected in this new version.

Second, since you added the table with the challenges in the discussion, the list of five main takeaways at the end is not introduced. Instead, the text says "Table 2 summarizes the challenges...", then as soon as the table is over it starts a list of challenges (line 306) This is confusing.

**Answer:** We appreciate the comment made by the reviewer, and we have included an introduction sentence to the five main points (line 304 - 305).

Third, the rows in Table 2 are weirdly aligned and spaced.

**Answer:** We appreciate the comment made by the reviewer, and we have fixed the alignment and space in Table 2.

Finally, there are some minor typos (e.g. "are" instead of "is" in line 187, and a 1 in a different font in line 223). Please, carefully go through the manuscript one last time.

**Answer:** We appreciate the comment made by the reviewer, and we have corrected the typos.

Otherwise, I am happy to see the work that the authors have put into this piece and I look forward to seeing it published.

**Answer:** We appreciate very much all the comments made by the reviewer. It helped increase the quality of our text a lot.