

**Review article: Current approaches and critical issues in multi-risk recovery planning of urban areas exposed to natural hazards**

Soheil Mohammadi, Silvia De Angeli, Giorgio Boni, Francesca Pirlone, and Serena Cattari

Dear authors,

Thank you very much for your efforts and congratulations for tackling the comments in such an extensive and detailed way. In my view, this has now greatly improved the manuscript. As mentioned previously, I believe this paper is a great addition to the growing field of understanding multi-hazard risks and associated management practices.

Please see some minor comments below:

- P1 L8-10 Suggestion to separate this into two sentences
- P1 L11 "Improve urban system recoverability" – In my view, this is redundant, please reconsider.
- In the Abstract, and later in the paper, you mix multi-risk and multi-hazard risk. Please ensure the consistency, especially as later on you refer to Ward et al 2022 paper.
- P1 L28 "hazard mitigation" it is not clear what this refers to and entails
- P2 L22 "safe refuges" to be changes to "safe refuge" or "safe heaven."
- P2 L60 change "composed by" to "composed of"
- P2 L64 Not just rapid expansion, but also unplanned and not risk informed. Please see Cremen et al. (2023) A state-of-the-art decision-support environment for risk-sensitive and pro-poor urban planning and design in Tomorrow's cities
- P2 L70 Meerow et al (2016), please add page number as this is a direct quote
- P3 L124-126 A lot of research is quantifying the benefit ratios of investing in preparedness. Perhaps worthwhile reflecting on this research.
- P4 L218 Please rephrase "provide some hints" when referring to the methodology section
- Figure 1: Many thanks for making it. I suggest adding some keywords below "Keywords + databases" and an indication of a number of papers.
- Table 1: If you see as important, perhaps add a column that will add "recovery as a desired outcome" and "recovery as a process", to align text and definitions
- P11 L470 Reflect on the overlap of DRM phases (see Twigg, J., 2015. Disaster Risk Reduction-Good Practice Review 9. 2nd ed. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute.)
- P12 L508-512 Your paragraphs are still very long which makes it at times challenging for the reader. Perhaps in places like this you could simplify through bullet pointing to increase the readability.
- P12 L512 Naturally, here is a new paragraph?
- P12 L517 Same as the previous comment.
- P13 L557 Please define functionality.
- P15 L643 "Emergency phase" or "Response phase"? Response has been used previously. Please ensure consistency of terms throughout the paper.
- Table 2: You mention 8 publications but have only 2 in the table?
- P22 L900-902 Please rephrase the sentence.
- P23 Too long – an example where the text could be cut significantly. Perhaps some of the critique can be integrated in Table 3 and text shortened.
- Figure 5: instead of "time frame" please add "time frames"