The paper is about a very relevant topic relevant in today's world where herbivores and predators are expanding in parts of the globe, in ever-closer growing contact with humans. It aims to investigate how risk from hunters and predators affect deer behavior (syndromes). The paper presents a lot of valuable data, including very nice experiments, that help to answer the research questions. Yet currently I think the paper is not clearly structured and written which hampers bringing across the message. Therefore I would advise to severely revise the text of this manuscript to enhance the clarity, before considering publication. See below for explanation on the major remark and more detailed comments.

Major remark 1: Clarity/structure: The text is in many places not well structured and has an unsuitable use of paragraphs. The abstract lacks important information. Throughout, the text and structure of the papers should be enhanced. The methods and data analyses seem legit but it is difficult to assess with the text in this condition.

- The introduction does not accurately situate the research within context and does not highlight research gaps. It provides a nice introduction to the ecology of fear but then quickly jumps to the current study, without obvious links.
- Methods: Maybe it is good to give a general overview of all the island first. Overall structure could improve. A lot of data is collected in different projects, perhaps provide an overview and introduction to this. Also, the role of large predators is small in the methods. What are their densities, what is known on their behavior and prey choice?
- If you want to elucidate the role between forage availability and risk, is another, more appropriate analysis then possible?
- So many nice experiments and data! Please provide an overview at the start of the methods, and link each to a hypothesis and make clear in the results and discussion how you come to your conclusions.
- The discussion addressed many of my thoughts, but the structure and clarity can be improved, and moreover sometimes the conclusions are too broad, general and strong.

Detailed comments:

L29: "deer in risk-free population" is this grammatically correct?

L42: the mention of the 'intertidal zone' comes a bit out of nowhere. This could be described in the methods section of the abstract (which seems to be lacking).

L51-62: Nice background. But if needed you could start closer to the topic by introducing (behaviorally mediated) predator-prey interactions; i.e. ecology of fear, as done in the second paragraph, and leave this first paragraph out.

L67-69: Landscapes of fear, and how they affect ecosystems could be more precisely explained.

L56: typo: '['

L75-76: I do not agree that it was (only) the increase in large herbivore populations that allowed predators such as wolves to recover, also land-use changes and legislation seem important to me, at least locally.

L81-82: it seems to me that these undesirable impacts of herbivores should be either mentioned and exemplified, or not.

L86: what do you mean with 'effects of high deer abundance'. Maybe introduce this beforehand?

Methods

L106-L108: most of the area is forest, but are there open patches? Intertidal? Describe here?

L177: how was data normalized?

L182-183: how were activity patterns measured? Not clear here, it is later on in L267-268.

L196: grammar: "...for by..."

L217: how often did deer move out of sight?

L278: I wonder if the fact that the selection of repeatedly trapped deer affects results, as they may have personalities different from those of the main population.

L280: redundant [

L291-359: The paragraphs are not so well organized.

L640-644: "these result illustrate" I find a bit bold and brief.,

L780-787: does your data allow to elucidate between effects of forage or risk?

L801-802: Did hunting lead to altered behavior or was it selection of individual's personalities? It is discussed in the following paragraph but not clear here.

Discussion has valid points but I find it a bit chaotic and unstructured and the effects of risk and resources are intertwined and cannot be really disentangled.

Abstract: it is not entirely clear what was measured and which analyses were done. It would be good to mention this in the abstract.

Keywords: can keywords be a combination of words?