

Editor's Comment:

Minor revisions are required:

1. For Line-72, 164, 239 & 251: Revise use of backdrop as advised. See suggestion.-**Revised**
2. Line 296: Agreed with author, APA is not the journal format. But still, the author has not followed the journal format! It should be Author(s). Title. Journal Name, Year, Volume (Issue): pp.
Formatted as Journal Style
3. Most of your statistical tests showed that the two tribes were at par in respect of the variables. It would even be more interesting if you raised the level of significance (p level) to say 90%. So statements like Angami community is less vulnerable than Ao though statistically at par in community vulnerability may be contradictory to some readers: Where is the correction in the text? Show page and line please. The issue raised by the reviewer (in the abstract section) has not been addressed. Address the contradiction.**All contradictions have been addressed by modifying the sentences. (Line 10-11: Abstract& Line 304-307).**
4. A statement would also suffice why vulnerability assessment was more appropriate in relation to other methods even if you stated that it is complicated: Where is the correction in the text? Show page and line please. No action taken (Line 173-174). Revise as suggested please.**Action taken. Line added (Line: 193-196)**
5. I would also suggest more discussions of the results than is currently the case where some results are not discussed at all. For instance, more Ao are educated but are more food insecure, have poor housing, - therefore less resistant to exposure, more sensitive to vulnerability or susceptibility, have less savings and less stable occupation. What is happening to their type of education?:Where is the correction in the text? Show page and lines please. Scanning through the manuscript, the DISCUSSION part in section 3.0 remains thin. Refer to previous research to support your arguments/findings. Attend to this concern.**More discussion added (Line: 260-264, 277-282, 302-312, 328-363)**

Answer to the comments in the file (Changes can be tracked)

Comment	Answer
DO1: Address this contradiction	Contradiction is addressed by deleting and modifying the sentence according to the intension of the study
DO2:Describe the study area, including the tribes, here.	Described as suggested
DO3:Consider to present this part before you present data analysis procedures.	Presented before data analysis (sampling size)
DO4:Why do you need 2.2.1 when you do not have 2.2.2? Delete this sub-heading.	Deleted sub-head 2.2.1
DO5:Provide citation for this.	Citation provided
DO6:Provide citation	Citation provided
DO7:Separate Study Site from Sampling Procedure and Size. Take the Study Site part (including map) to sub-section 2.1	Study site part including map is taken to Sub-Sec-2.1

DO8:You have not explained the source of Exposure data. Please present under Sampling Size and Procedure. Please clarify on the source and sampling techniques of how you identified hazards (drought, landslides, cyclones, etc)	Source of exposure data is mentioned in sec. 2.3. Procedure is discussed.
DO9:Follow the journal format please.	Journal format followed