

Dear referee,

thank you very much for your overall positive response to our paper and research. We also appreciate the specific issues you raised and the valuable thoughts. In response, we would like to address your comments.

1. Please clarify whether retreat, relocation and resettlement are synonyms or define different approaches. If they are considered as synonyms please make use of only one of these terms. Otherwise, please explain the differences.

Indeed, we are using various terms at different times, partially without defining them in a detailed manner. We commit ourselves to clarify the terms and the use of them in the revised version of the paper. By doing so, we will apply an understanding or definition of the terms retreat, relocation and resettlement in the same way as in our previous work (Lauer et al. 2021). This implies:

- Retreat: “Planned, managed, and permanent movement (retreating) of people and/or infrastructure away from hazard-prone areas to reduce hazard exposure and, ultimately, the hazard risk” (Lauer et al. 2021: 2)
- Relocation and resettlement: Whereas retreat is understood in this study as a mostly scientific and political strategy, resettlement and relocation are the practical components and the terms that are used in practice by stakeholders. Although the terms relocation and resettlement have slightly different meaning, we use them interchangeably in the study (as this is the case in many political agendas in the Philippines). We follow a definition by Fernando (2004) who described both as a “physical movement of people to a new place to live other than the previous place”

Lauer, H.; Delos Reyes, M.; Birkmann, J. Managed Retreat as Adaptation Option: Investigating Different Resettlement Approaches and Their Impacts—Lessons from Metro Manila. Sustainability 2021, 13, 829. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020829>

Fernando, N. Forced Relocation After the Indian Ocean Tsunami, 2004: Case Study of Vulnerable Populations in Three Relocation Settlements in Galle, Sri Lanka. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany, 2010.

2. A fundamental question is whether the relatively small selection of 3 or 7 case studies for in- and off-city resettlement is sufficient to draw general conclusions about the advantages and disadvantages of the two strategies such as " The second major insight of the assessment is that post-relocation conditions only slightly vary between the two resettlement types"

Certainly, a household survey is inherently limited by its sample size, reproducing “only” a picture or fraction of reality. Due to financial and organizational constraints, we had to restrict the number of settlements investigated. The survey spanned nearly six weeks, and our site selection was carefully undertaken, guided by a detailed resettlement typology developed beforehand (Lauer et al., 2021). This typology considered various settlement aspects, including size, age, housing type, program and involved stakeholders. We aimed to mirror the existing distribution, with most resettlement sites being Off-City sites. Consequently, the majority of our sites are Off-City and “only” three are In-City. But even among these three In-City sites, there is diversity : Bistekville 2 is an LGU-administered site with mixed housing types; Disiplina Village (Ugong) is also LGU-administered but operates under a rent scheme;

Manggahan Residences is an NHA site with a People's Plan approach and medium-rise buildings. With these three settlements, we think we cover a spectrum of settlement types, providing a comprehensive view of In-City settlements.

We appreciate your caution regarding generalizing statements and agree that precision is crucial. To address this concern, we can modify our wording to convey a more nuanced perspective. For instance, we can state: "Based on the obtained data in the selected case study sites, the second major insight of our assessment is that post-relocation conditions only slightly vary between the analysed two resettlement categories."

3. It is surprising that access to services of general interest (health care, education, culture etc.) was not considered as enabling factor. I can be assumed that in-city resettlement areas perform much better because of their proximity to infrastructure clusters

Access to the mentioned services was considered as enabling factor, but we named it "Access to basic amenities" respectively "Availability of basic services" in chapter 4.3.5. This chapter delves into the analysis of access to the basic services electricity, water and sewage treatment. Further, we analysed the accessibility of education and health facilities. Notably, we did not assess access to cultural services.

Our collected data indicates a general improvement in the access to electricity, water and sewage treatment across all settlements, with a slightly more favourable outcome in In-City settlements. Furthermore, the access to schools mainly improved in the course of resettlement while the access to health facilities is the only service where there is mainly a noticeable decline in access for those resettled to Off-City location (refer to Figure 4 for the detailed statistics).

4. The policy recommendations are rather generic. One would like to see more specific recommendations regarding the possible need for amendments to existing legislation and policies for resettlement in the Philippines

During the research process, numerous findings and policy recommendations were generated and discussed. However, for the sake of shortening the already very extensive paper, these were summarized in the final chapters. Consequently, the recommendations may have become rather generic. In the revised version of the paper, we can commit ourselves checking the recommendations and trying to refine them in order to provide more specific and tailor-made recommendations.