

Dear Editor,

we sincerely thank you for your insightful and constructive comments, and for the opportunity to further improve our manuscript and clarify its key messages.

We have addressed the comments as follows:

RC1: While the paper is conceptually sound, the added value of this Perspective could be more clearly stated. A short paragraph, perhaps in the introduction or conclusion, highlighting the specific theoretical or integrative contribution (beyond existing literature) would enhance the manuscript's distinctiveness and impact.

Author answers to RC1: we have inserted a clarifying paragraph at the end of the Introduction section:

Conceptually, this Invited Perspective addresses these challenges and advances the ongoing debate on DRR (e.g., Bourgeois et al., 2024; Alcántara-Ayala et al., 2025) by reframing them not as isolated deficits but as a coupled system of constraints. We synthesise recurring implementation deficits into a coherent, cross-hazard framework and argue that the persistence of risk is best understood through the interaction of four interdependent constraints: limited awareness, deficiencies in capacities, misaligned incentives, and governance barriers. The added value of this contribution lies in integrating these dimensions into a unified analytical lens that emphasises their systemic interplay across scales, sectors, and hazard types, illustrated through the 2025 California wildfires and other large events. Crucially, it is this interaction, rather than any single factor, that systematically drives persistent implementation gaps across hazards and contexts.

RC2: Discussion of the institutional and regulatory landscape in California remains somewhat dispersed across sections. A brief, coherent summary explaining the core governance actors, regulatory structures, and known systemic bottlenecks would help anchor the case more firmly and directly address the concerns about contextual grounding.

Author answers to RC2: we have inserted a clarifying paragraph at the beginning of the Conclusion section:

It has been shown that the institutional and regulatory landscape of wildfire risk management in California is characterised by a multi-level and fragmented governance structure. At the federal level, agencies play a dominant role in wildfire suppression and emergency response, while regulatory authority over land-use planning and building practices largely rests with state and especially local governments (counties and municipalities). Although building codes and defensible space requirements exist in high-risk areas, there is no comprehensive statewide framework that systematically restricts development based on wildfire risk. In addition, a complex mix of public and private actors, including insurance providers, utilities, and community-based initiatives such as CWPPs, shape risk reduction practices. This fragmented allocation of responsibilities, combined with uneven enforcement capacity, financial constraints, and misaligned incentives (e.g. federal cost

absorption for suppression versus local responsibility for mitigation), creates systemic bottlenecks that hinder the consistent implementation of DRR measures.

In addition, minor corrections have been made throughout the manuscript, which are highlighted in the tracked-changes version.

Finally, we would like to once again thank the reviewer and the Editor for the opportunity to revise and improve the manuscript. We greatly appreciate the constructive feedback, which has helped us to strengthen the clarity and contribution of the paper.