Response to Reviewer 2_ Round 2

Dear Reviewer,

We are sincerely grateful for your time and effort reviewing our responses and sending your feedback again. As previously done, the changes in the manuscript can be tracked, however, to facilitate the review formal changes, minor changes and changes from round 1 have been accepted Furthermore, we would like to express our apologies for not assessing in the first round, your comments on ES classification, socio-cultural challenges and conclusions. However, it has been a prolific experience to go throughout the manuscript considering your expert advice and suggestions, so we have introduced all your suggestions in this round.

About the changes in this version: The abstract section has been rewritten. The introduction has new lines, which are inserted from other sections. The methods has changes in the structure and the figure is bigger. The results section has several changes, mainly the format and names for presenting the ES; other modifications include the order of sub-sections, the figures include the labels; and for uniformity across the aspects new tables have been included (Table 2, 3, 4, 8). The discussion section has new lines and changes in structure for explaining better the lessons and barriers. The conclusions section has changed similarly, new lines and changes in structure for sending a clearer message about the lessons and barriers. Appendix A has changed also, new tables have been included (tables A3 and A7). Table A4 and A5 have updated the names of the ES, although, no changes are marked. Please find the specific responses to your valuable comments in the next page.

Thank you again for your time and collaboration,

	Reviewer comments	Responses
Point 1:	The manuscript improved since my last revision, but I found some comments not assessed. I am particularly worried about your classification of Ecosystem Services, as I believe the paper is not fully following any classification, and some errors are present (e.g. Habitat, if not considered a supporting services, it DO is a regulation one).	The ES section has changed to follow the TEEB classification.
Point 2:	Lines 112-114 "This review is ensuring a logical process through a descriptive search procedure and the specification of inclusion and exclusion criteria" - I think this should be removed. It is implicit/it should be judged by the reader (editors) while reading your methodology. You're not supposed to self-assess your methodology so explicitly. It may be kind of obvious that the methodology is good since you're publishing it on a IF-ranked journal - no need to over enhance it!	The sentence has been deleted.
Point 3:	Lines 126 - 127 "selection was carried out by two people (R.P.-A. and G.M.-G.) following an outlined structure of aspects including location" - no need to specify it. The "Author Contributions" section can be used.	The sentence has been deleted, but not included in authors contributions. Recognition to the help of G.M.-G. is presented in acknowledgements.
Point 4:	Figure 1: is too small	Size of figure has been increased.
Point 5:	Answer to my point 10: Point 10: "Table 1: Why does socio-cultural services are a water challenge? Lines 168-175. Explanation included. Since the challenges included are directly related to water, but could relate to other aspects, we have delete the 'water' term to present all the challenges found in the literature. In addition, the information is complemented with cases descriptions in Appendix 1 Table A2." I found this comment not assessed. I think a real "challenge" is not explained. A challenge is an open point and I don't see which is the open point here. I would expect something like "Low consideration of socio-cultural services while implementing NBS" - this is a challenge. Please respond to this comment.	We consider that the challenge is related to the effective incorporation of socio-cultural services.
Point 6:	Answer to my point 2. Authors state to use CICES classification v5.1 for ecosystem services. I found some relevant errors in the use of the classification. If fact, at pages 22-onward of the document the authors themselves cited (https://cices.eu/content/uploads/sites/8/2018/01/Guidance-V51-01012018.pdf) it appears clear that habitat in NOT a provision ES, as wrongly shown in figure 3, but a regulating one (!).	The ES section has changed to follow the TEEB classification. The section 3.1.2 has changed to present the ES. We have introduced table 2 for ES descriptions. In Appendix A, Table A3 has been introduced to

	I strongly suggest to carefully revise the ES classification used for the paper, since some errors are present. For example, "water harvesting" is NOT an ES reported in CICES v5.1 classification. If you want to use CICES 5.1, please structure your paper according to it, namely using tables in appendix 1.	show the Structure of ES and description (TEEB) and main aspects identified and Table A4, List of cases with Ecosystem services follows the new classification. Table A5 is updated with the changes in the names of the ES.
Point 7:	Figure 4: it has improved, but all "columns" should be labelled	The figure has been updated with labels and ES changes.
Point 8:	Lines 411-412: "This work identified as a main overall lesson learnt that NBS as a comprehensive approach implemented as a systemic response to deliver multiple benefits" I have difficulties in understanding this passage in English, please rephrase	Lines 410-411 Sentence has been rephrased as “As an overall lesson learnt, this work identified that NBS could deliver multiple benefits if implemented as a systemic response to deploy its comprehensive approach.”
Point 9:	Lines 415-420: these lines of the conclusion are not specific and quite general. As I suggested in my previous review, a clear take away message should be included. This can be a good takeaway message, but needs to be clearer. On the contrary, paragraph 4.2 is quite good and authors could take some elements from there and reuse them shortly in the discussion.	Conclusions has been rewritten.