

Dear Reviewer 4,

Thank you for your helpful feedback. We greatly appreciate the time and effort you have put into improving the manuscript.

Usage errors remain, e.g. 'we synthesis four' in the abstract. Please re-read carefully for content e.g. lack of space on line 164, 170 etc.

Thank you for pointing this out. We have corrected the tense and reread the paper carefully to check for missing spaces.

We are also making the same small additional changes in grammar and wording: e.g. updated the title, as we have 2025 and some references date from 2025.

We also use topics, themes, findings and overarching insights consistently: Several **topic** are suggested and collected by the survey. The editorial board selected 8 **themes** (e.g by merging, extend and rejecting topics), which include "new" **findings** of research (beside well known "old" background information). By analysing the themes, we have synthesised 4 **overarching insights**.

See all tiny changes in the track changes document.

30: what is intended for the 'series'? perhaps just note it is a report as its unclear what will happen going forward although I agree that the Reviews and Syntheses format in Biogeosciences is a good way to do so.

Good Point. We rephrase the corresponding sentence to make the intention of the series clearer

I respect the honesty of fig. 1 and the imbalance in responses but this figure could be improved by including numbers in addition to the pie chart.

Done

103: who is the editorial board?

We revised the sentence to better describe the editorial board: The editorial board, consisting of six professors (see authors' contribution) with experience in ecology, sociology and economics, made the final selection based on the following criteria:

123: value should include uncertainty

we added the range of the measurements given in the publication of Alongi 2012

146: quotes aren't needed because it has the effect of trivializing content.  
removed

155: 'Stakeholders have insufficiently considered locally relevant species when planning with nature-based solutions' is vague. It helps to avoid the use of 'stakeholder' because this has anti-Indigenous connotations, at least in the U.S.

We reformulate the sentence omitting the term “stakeholders”.

250: sentence fragment.

corrected.

3.2.3: some of these arguments are simultaneously oversimplified and incomplete because atmospheric boundary layer dynamics are complex

(<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-24551-5>), cloud nucleation changes (<https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/9/6531/2009/>) and much more. I guess that the brief treatment given to each topic is ok if it helps encourage discussion and study.

We agree, as it is always a challenge to simplify without oversimplifying. We have therefore added selected points and refer to the relevant papers.

I'm not entirely convinced that section 3.8 is a topic but may be part of solutions.

We have chosen this topic to inspire and motivate the reader to think outside the box, especially in the long term.

Thank you once more for your helpful feedback!