

This review paper brings together a synthesis of the ERA framework. The concept is timely and important, and while I concur with most of the points raised by Reviewer 1 and find the authors' response by and large adequate, a few technical issues still remain:

1. Table 1: In my opinion this table can be turned into a paragraph with proper referencing, and short explanations of the articles mentioned here, their contributions, and what they lack. It is a review article after all, and instead of giving a list of articles in a table format, I would much prefer to read how the authors think they contribute to the overall framework (or do they?).
2. Instead of presenting the review questions in a semi-bullet format, which in fact reads much like a draft, again I would much prefer to read them within a proper paragraph. In their current form, they break the flow. Again, a review article should be a synthesis, and also one where the reader can concentrate on the information without structural breaks. While the current format the authors choose may work in a presentation, not so much as a section in a review article. It would be best if the authors re-structured and somewhat merged the section from lines 95-120. The scientific questions and the article's contributions and how this review will approach these issues can better be edited together into one or maximum two paragraphs. Especially the last part (the whole paragraph describing the article's sections) reads like a list and does not add any novel contribution to the subject being reviewed, but can be turned to a roadmap for the reader who may want to focus on a specific part of the review if better structured as a sentence or two.
3. Per my comment above, you may alternately consider making better use of the figure captions. "System framework diagram" on its own makes no sense, and for the readers who consider the figures first and the writing next, it needs better explanation of more how this figure contributes to the review rather than what they are looking at. The authors may consider working on the caption of this figure along with the previous paragraphs to provide unity and continuity, but most importantly, context.
4. Because of the points raised in the previous paragraphs, the introductory sentence to Methodology section is repetitive.
5. My suggestion is to move Figures 2 and 3 to Appendix or Supplementary. Again, a review article's most important aspect is the "review" or the synthesis or the subject. The statistics are often secondary unless they contribute majorly to the subject being reviewed (for example, if the aim is to show the lack of literature on a certain subject to encourage researchers to consider this gap, literature statistics are important. And if this is the case with ERA, then the authors should mention it. If not, these figures don't do much for the main article).

6. Section 3. Composition and Definition: If this will be a separate section, even though only an introduction, I would expect it to be a bit longer, providing more information as to possibly the evolution of the concept, how this definition came to be. Also “composition” in the title doesn’t make much sense to me, so unless it is better explained immediately after the section title, I suggest remove it altogether.
7. Subsection 3.1 continues to mention methodology, and I suggest authors incorporate it above to Section 2.
8. In 3.2 and 3.3 I find the subsection titles unnecessary. They break the flow.
9. The caption for Figure 4 can use a more detail. Same for Figure 5. Just describing the figures is barely enough for an article. How this figure contributes to the subject at hand should be detailed.
10. Similar issues on Section 4. The introduction (since this is a review) should be a bit more explanatory. Not a single sentence. It would even be better if they included some references. For example, “the advantages of ERA have been detailed as .. by ...” I, as a reader would like to see why only four points summarize the advantages of the framework. Is it because certain literature established this, or is it because the research thus far is limited.
11. Lines 441-443 would better be incorporated into a paragraph with proper references (who applied these selection criteria to their research, or who established these as selection criteria) The way it reads now is much like an opinion piece than a review. My aim reading a review is mainly to find out about the studies in a certain field, and building a reading list for future research.
12. Lines 448-453 can easily be turned into a paragraph, even a sentence.
13. Same for lines 463-482. Also, previously it was mentioned that “This section summarizes the representative emergency response systems and platforms that frequently appear in the literature ...” however I cannot see any reference to any literature. I gather that there are Tables, but again I would like to read a synthesis of the articles provided in these lists with proper in paragraph referencing. The authors may choose to include the Table in the Appendix or a Supplementary file, alternatively.
14. 5.2 and 6.3, again, please integrate the bullet points into proper paragraphs.
15. Fig. 8 please expand the caption to include detailed information (see previous comments on Figures).
16. Table 5 can massively benefit from proper references. Right now I don’t know if this is what the readers think or what their literature review rendered. Lines 661-668 which refer to the table also has no references.
17. Section 6.5 can also benefit from my previous comments of structure and flow.