

Authors' Response (McMillan et al.)

The authors would like to sincerely thank both reviewers for their constructive comments. We have revised the manuscript accordingly. Please find our point-by-point replies below.

Reviewer Comment	Author Reply
<i>Reviewer #1</i>	
376 a verb seems to be missing	We corrected this (see sentence "...are more often affected...").
very good spatial check of distribution first also to include feedback of the planners, simplicity, weighting, census data did the planners also discourage certain variables to use?	See response in the interactive discussion.
for the pluvial index; briefly explain why you excluded green spaces. They can have a sponge capacity overall, however, likely being to small in capacity, maybe.	We added an explanation (see paragraph "While green space is also important...").
"use-intensity" about line 518-521, please explain more, how you calculated the difference between the forest and the very small park.	We added a more detailed explanation of the calculation steps (see paragraph "...To do this, we first calculated the "use-intensity" of the green spaces...") and the GIS workflow as supplementary material.
Figure 8 caption: add (old age; housing and low income) which makes it more easily readable	Done (see Figure 2 caption).
549: add a short explanation of your assumptions for an international audience: single-family homes will be replaced by....?	We added an explanation (see sentence "...if the policy of reducing land consumption...").
Figure 10: add "heat" to the caption	Done (see Figure 10 caption).
556 "in" is missing	We will correct this and add the reference to the appendix (see "...is included in the appendix (Figure A2).").
580 why is this a challenge? Explain with one small example. This is especially important when it comes to your main conclusions in lines 594-597.	We added an explanation (see paragraph "For example, a flood is hazardous sometimes more due to the water depth...").
594: adaptation needs: how do you derive that, from what? The text and maps were not about that(?) 595: also very important, but how and where did you derive which measures? Lines 598-602 are good in this direction, but should be expanded a bit and put before 594	We rewrote this paragraph (see paragraph "Despite these open questions, the overlay of social vulnerability maps with hazard maps can...").
Are there flood vulnerability maps missing in the annex?	We added the synthesis map "social vulnerability to pluvial flooding" to the appendix (see Figure A2).
<i>Reviewer #2</i>	
Abstract: Please add data analysis text	We added a sentence to the abstract (see sentence "In this paper, we use a GIS-based method for mapping quantitative indicators...").
Line80. We start this paper by providing an overview...and planning practice (Section 7.3). " Can be deleted.	We shortened this paragraph (see paragraph "In this paper, we first summarise the research on the spatial dimension...").
In urban planning, spatial planning is often seen in the German context. Can the framework apply to other world planning systems? Please add discussion on it.	Yes, there are lessons from this paper that apply to other planning systems, we added a paragraph to the discussion (see paragraph "While this paper has focused on the specific case of the region...").
Figure 2. Since vulnerability is a negative term, it is advised environmental justice to injustice (better use Climate injustice).	We changed the term in the figure to environmental injustice (see Figure 2).
I see some repetition in the analysis and discussion sections. Please reduce redundancy.	We revisited sections 6 and 7 to reduce redundancy.