**Towards a cohesive understanding of ecological complexity (Riva, Graco-Roza et al.). Response to the comments from the editor and reviewers**

**Editorial comments**

Editor One Comments: I commend the authors for the diligent revision of their manuscript. At this stage we are only in need of minor changes following the advise of reviewer 2. In addition, I think it would be worthwhile to check the literature cited for glitches for example citation 60 should be JH Brown, and 85 has the same author listed twice in addition of including info about the author.

R: We thank the Editor and the Reviewer for their final comments which we integrated into the manuscript.

**Reviewer: 2**

The authors have addressed all of my previous comments and I think the paper should now be accepted. I do have a few more comments stemming from the authors response to my previous review.

R: We thanked the referee for his positive attitude and encouraging comment. We have further considered the additional suggestion.

The addition of Figure 1 is much appreciated and helps to clarify the analyses. However, I don't think that the inset thumbnails of later figures is appropriate here and I think that these should be removed.

R: We followed the reviewer’s suggestion and removed the inset thumbnails from Figure 1. In lieu of the insets, we added graphical representations of the type of the mentioned analyses.

I would still like stronger statements about the caveats of the analysis and known ecological concepts that are not included here. The challenge I keep having is that some of the most famous and cited papers in ecological complexity are missed by this analysis. Perhaps adding something like the following would help: "Our analysis certainly misses some concepts in ecological complexity associated with the type of topic modeling that we used, and future perspectives will certainly need to add concepts that we have not included here.

R: We have added this sentence to the caveats section.

My comment about Figure 4 was that the color scheme makes it very hard to differentiate low from high co-occurrence strength on the edges and this is still the case in the current version of the figure. It is not visually easy to see differences in the low co-occurrence strength links.

R: We understand the reviewer concern. However, we would like to stress that much of the confusion arises from the nature of the data and not the color gradient. Most of the observation aggregate around lower values (i.e., 0.25), and hence, changing the color palette adds little to improving readability.