

Reviewer 2

This manuscript is an ambitious endeavour, covering very much field. The topic is very important and I congratulate the authors for taking up the challenge.

However I think some major improvements need to be done with the manuscript.

Thank you indeed for your appraisal and suggestions, which we will try to follow as far as possible.

First of all, it is a review paper, yet the methods of the review have not been outlined at all. While a full systematic review might be too much to carry out, the methods of article finding and selection should be clearly explained and - to the extent possible - repeatable.

We will add a paragraph in the introduction, shortly explaining the process of writing this paper. From installing the Baltic Earth Grand Challenge on this topic, to recruiting a core writing team and topic list at a dedicated workshop in Tallinn 20218, to establishing a basic framework and structure for the paper, to collecting and integrating individual contributions by co-authors, to using the "matrix" to visualize connections in a table, and describing the connections in bullet lists with references. We hope that is what the reviewer has in mind.

Secondly, the criteria for the "##" and "?" categories should be clearly defined and constant throughout the article. This is not currently the case. For example, on r. 1106 -> and 1118, it says there is a + effect, but there are no references to back up these claims. On row 1120 the text says "may be" but it is marked as +, not as ?, and the given reference doesn't relate to tourism at all.

We will go through all the connections, check and revise the + and ? connections so that there are references for a + connection in any case; and we will try to better explain the criteria used.

Secondly, the paper is unnecessarily long. It covers a lot of ground, which makes it long by necessity, but that being the case, the authors should be extra careful to include only relevant information. At the moment, the introductory sections for each pressure are way too detailed. It would serve the paper better to just give the necessary amount of background that is needed to understand the bullet points below, not give a general review of the pressure.

Thank you for this suggestion, which we will absolutely agree with. We will eliminate unnecessary repetitions (section 6 will be altogether deleted, and the key messages will be inserted into the section 5 subsections. Also, the introductory paragraphs in section 5 will be shortened considerably, we agree that these are less crucial to the paper than the bullet lists. Also the introduction and summary will be shortened, so that we hope to arrive at a much more concise and denser manuscript.

I recommend that the authors

- shorten the manuscript considerably
Will do
- check the consistency of the criteria of the + and ? classes across all of the work (also considering the joint effects that are implicitly considered as missing!)
Will do
- outline the review process
Will do