

We thank John Hillier for his insightful community comment. Below, we briefly respond (in black) to his comments (in blue):

Caveat: This is a brief community comment, in which the authors and editors should note a potential conflict of interest as I am an Exec. Editor of *Geoscience Communication* [Not handling editor for this manuscript] and because I'm clearly pointing to my own work.

Comment: I do not pretend a full overview of this subject area, but have a few specific pieces of knowledge that the authors might consider incorporating. The two non-editorials might either be outside the scope of the authors definitions of 'communicating climate science', or out of scope due to their publication/submission date. However, very briefly noting them might help (i) sharpen their definition/scope which I didn't read as excluding the suggestions I make and (ii) and potentially recognise upcoming work.

Use the community? There may also be an opportunity to ask the community to contribute examples they know by commenting on the discussion paper.

We absolutely agree that our manuscript is an opportunity to contribute examples by the community, which is one of the reasons why we submitted our manuscript to *Geoscience Communication*. This specific Community Comment is a good example of such a discussion, fully in the spirit of Open Science.

Why are the following out of scope?

- <https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/1/35/2018> - Contains a communication activity that is evaluated.

This is indeed an interesting manuscript. We have looked through our data, and this manuscript was not picked up in our literature search because it did not contain all the search terms (Table 1) in the title, abstract or keywords. In particular, "Climate change" does not appear in the title, abstract or keywords of <https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/1/35/2018>. We prefer to keep our original literature search strategy, which was carefully crafted to be a balance between breadth and our specific scope to climate change issues (rather than all geoscience).

- Suggest the authors review papers published in *Geoscience Communication*.

Our initial literature search (Table 1) did pick up an article in *Geoscience Communication* (<https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/3/381/2020/>), but that did not pass through our subsequent selection criteria.

Detail of 4 papers: In Section 2.1 'Importance of Evaluation', it might be worth noting that this aligns entirely with *GCs* principles for publication as outlined in two editorials

- <https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/1/1/2018>
- <https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/4/493/2021>

This is a good idea; we will refer to one or both of these editorials in our revised manuscript.

There is also a paper of mine that was in *GC Discussions* since June 2023 on ‘*A tool to co-create impactful university-industry projects for natural hazard risk mitigation*’, which contains an evaluation (Case Study) of a project on climate-driven hydrological risk. <https://egusphere.copernicus.org/preprints/2023/egusphere-2023-1251>

While an interesting article, we prefer to keep our literature search to articles published between 2012 and 2022. A paper like this will otherwise never be finished. Nevertheless, highlighting these newer preprints in this comment is very valuable. We therefore propose to add a paragraph in the Discussion of the revised manuscript where we highlight that new papers have come to our attention in the review phase.

The project output is a blog published by the Bank of England - <https://bankunderground.co.uk/2021/04/08/its-windy-when-its-wet-why-uk-insurers-may-need-to-reassess-their-modelling-assumptions/>

I have also just submitted a GC Insights paper (after the submission of your manuscript) explicitly to evaluate a project to communicate climate related risk.

- The output of that work is <https://bankunderground.co.uk/2023/04/13/what-if-its-a-perfect-storm-stronger-evidence-that-insurers-should-account-for-co-occurring-weather-hazards/>
- ‘Open R-code to communicate the impact of co-occurring natural hazards’ - egusphere-2023-2799. <https://egusphere.copernicus.org/preprints/2023/egusphere-2023-2799>

Again, we prefer to keep our literature search to articles published between 2012 and 2022.