

The authors have provided thorough responses to my comments and suggestions, and the revised paper is much stronger and a clearer presentation. And, I also appreciate the clear discussion and justification regarding the practical usefulness of human pressure mapping for the conservation of biodiversity.

A couple of minor suggestions (your decision to incorporate or not):

- It is interesting that the highest uncertainty is where multiple pressures co-occur – might this also occur because of the nature of additive pressures (though you have adapted the overlaps using some hierarchical calculations – would it be simpler or the same if you simply used the maximum value of any pressure rather than the summation?)
- Glad to see the histogram of values – is part of the very long tail related to the “stretching” caused by the additive combination of pressures?
- Regarding the alignment of pressures with the IUCN threat taxonomy – I think the power of a taxonomy is that each pressure can be in one and only one threat class (perhaps analogous to a binomial nomenclature, a la Linnaeus). Maybe revisit your description of how pressures relate to threats?
- Regarding population density maps as a surrogate for accessibility – it seems this is a scale (resolution) dependent situation. As the resolution of maps increases (e.g., from 1 km to 0.1 km) and the dasymetric allocation of the population tightens to where buildings are located (at least for night-time population density), then is there less “spill-over” into adjacent (presumably accessible) areas?
- I appreciate your point about timing of publication for Theobald 2025 and powerlines/pipelines. I should have said Theobald et al. 2020 which contained powerlines as well.
- Thanks for providing the validation plot dataset.