

Comments to the author:

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing as executive editor of NHESS after your manuscript has gone through the peer-review process (thank you for engaging with this). I am asking for some editorial changes after reading your manuscript, and then will do a review. Once these are finished, I will be delighted to accept this for publication.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your time and consideration. We have revised the manuscript following your requests. Please find below our responses to each point.

1. Figures and colour blindness. Please reevaluate all figures for colour blindness, where colour alone determines an attribute. For examples, Figures 3 and 4 make heavy use of colour (an no other distinguishing features) to identify floods, extreme temperature, drought, storm. A colour blind person would find it very difficult to distinguish one attribute from another. Figure 5 is fine, because you have labelled the coloured segments. Figure 6, you ask the reader to distinguish blue and red, which would be difficult for a colour blind person.

We modified the figures as follow:

- Figure 3: The updated version uses lighter, colourblind-friendly colours, and each label is now assigned to a specific attribute. This makes all plot elements fully distinguishable.
- Figure 4: The colour bar has been updated. The figure was checked using online tools, and the colour combination is now fully colourblind friendly.
- Figure 6: We modified the description as follows: “The number in bold represents...” and ‘Marked with a star are the percentages of newly exposed elements...’.

The use of “bold” and “star” in the caption allow a full understanding of the plot.

2. Year of monetary amounts. For all monetary amounts listed, please ensure that it is clear from the text, what year the value is from (or if it has been normalised). For example (just one of many examples), when I go to Table 2, loss values are given for four events, from 2018 to 2023, but it is not clear what year these economic losses are representing

(or if inflation and normalisation for a given year have been taken into account in the values are given).

We thank the reviewer for this comment. The economic loss values reported in Table 2 were compiled from different external sources and publications associated with each event. In several cases, the original sources do not explicitly state whether the reported monetary amounts were adjusted for inflation or normalized to a reference year. If this is not provided the default assumption is always that it is in nominal values (meaning values of that year, without any deflation or inflation to a common price base). Therefore, to avoid introducing additional assumptions or inconsistencies, we retained the values as reported in the original sources.

To clarify this limitation, we added a statement in the table caption: 'The reported economic losses estimates are as reported in the original studies and are not adjusted for inflation.'

3. Throughout the paper, in-text citations. Ensure that all facts, ideas that are not common knowledge and from a source are properly cited. I found many sentences in the document where information should have a reference or refer the reader to a figure/table in the document where we can see that information. For example (and there are many, so you'll need to go over the entire paper): "Storms, windstorms, floods (pluvial, river and coastal), heatwaves and wildfires are climate extremes that affect European airport infrastructure the most." [This needs a reference--how do we know this?] " In Sicily, 55 separate wildfires broke out hitting Palermo and Catania airports." [This is a fact, from where do you know this?]

"Flooding is also leading to increasing problems and economic losses due to physical damage, as well as the suspension and cancellation of airport operations." This is a statement of fact, and needs a reference.

" Over the past three years, the frequency of such events has risen, affecting both inland airports through river floods, and coastal airports due to the growing risk of coastal flooding." Again, a fact, but with no reference.

Thank you for this point, we understand the confusion. As explained in Section 2.1 of the Data and Methods section, the first part of the manuscript consists of a literature review based on key documents for each sector. This means that, in some cases, several consecutive sentences or paragraphs are derived from the same source. In all the examples you mentioned, the cited text originates from the same reference, which is reported at the end of the paragraph, sometimes a few lines later.

To make this clearer and improve readability, I added an explicit reference to the Methods section, in which we cited the main references for the text, and included additional citations throughout the entire document wherever appropriate.

4. [Minor] Table headers always above the table (not below). You have done both.

We moved all the headers above the table, both for the main text and Appendix ones.

5. Placement of figures/tables. Figures and tables as well as their captions must be inserted in the main text near the location of the first mention (not appended to the end of the manuscript). You have put many figures at the end of the document, not where they were first mentioned.

We moved the figures close to the location of the first mention.

6. Mention of Figures? I could find no mention of Figures 4, 6, 8 in the text. All figures/tables must be mentioned at least once in the text, and where appropriate, discussed, so the reader told what to take away from the figure/table. Figure 4 is cited in line 218, Figure 6 is cited in line 439, Figure 8 is cited in line 464.

Overall, please read the guidelines for author submission carefully at <https://www.natural-hazards-and-earth-system-sciences.net/submission.html>. Many of the items mentioned above are part of the NHESS submission guidelines.

Thank you for pointing us to this source, we have carefully checked the guidelines and made amendments where appropriate.

Regards, Bruce Malamud