This paper contains a lot of information and is in a way a literature review with a proposed methodology for diagnostic and an application to study sites. I believe the contents are appropriate and people interested in the topic will find this a useful guide. Because of its nature, the paper has very little quantitative results, so the authors struggle to find a common synthesis or a final message.

I believe readers will benefit from a more succinct treatment in some of the sections. For example, sections 2 and 3 have lengthy introductory paragraphs that tell the reader what the authors are going to do next...I wonder if that is really necessary or if it is better to just mention what points are going to be touched upon and why. A better connection between sections 2, 3 and 4 can be provided, with a bit of a synthesis and perhaps based on Table 1. Table 1 should be moved up the manuscript, within section 2.

The end of the manuscript is rather abrupt. After going through the application sites the authors go straight to the conclusions, which is most of a summary. There is no discussion of differences or similitudes between sites, lessons learned or future work. I am sure that there are elements of all of this somewhere in the manuscript, but they need to be clearly synthesised at the end. This is, I believe, the main weakness of the manuscript.