

(1) By reading the introduction and the methods the general impression is that this work combines several existing data and methods (e.g., GCE model GRACE, ERA5 data) without spending much words on the actual contribution of the authors and how the applied methods in the selected context provide an innovative perspective on the multi-hazard theme. In other words, what the work reveals that could not be captured, or well interpreted, or understood, without the multi-hazard analysis? What is the added value? And how these insights help in adaptation? (adaptation is mentioned in the abstract without much results or discussion on that in the body of text).

Thank you for the comment. We will added a paragraph in the Discussion section
Additionally, we agree with the review that the adaptation part does not have much body in the main text, so this concept will be removed at places where it does not have added value.

(2) In the results the description of some of the figures/plots is missing. As if some of the figures does not contribute to the 'story' of the paper. I would suggest to clearly describe and discuss the provided images. Particularly Fig. 4 (not described and poorly readable) and Fig. 8.

Thank you for the comment, Fig. 4 will be updated to enhance its readability, and we will add a description. For Fig. 8 , we will also add a description.

In table 2 Bare rocks are listed as 'affected' by heatwaves, droughts, fires and their combination. Why? are bare rocks vulnerable? I think a bit of discussion and comment on this would be precious for the reader.

Thank you for the comment, we will add a discussion point as to the relevance of mentioning “bare rocks” affected by multi-hazards.

Figure 9. Caption. It seems that also indirect impacts are shown, not only direct.

We appreciate the referee's comment. That is true. The caption of Figure 9 will be revised as “Direct and indirect impacts on the domestic economy by sectors due to 2018 multi-events in Scandinavia”.

There are some typos, e.g. reference to Fig.16 that does not exist (l. 273), please check the text carefully.

We will remove the typos and will go over the manuscript another time in detail to filter potential other typos.