

	1 st reviewer	
	Specific suggestions	Improvement made/to be made (page numbers where the corrections are made should be made at the end of the revision process)
1.	methodological description to be insufficiently robust. But not to the extent of describing specific approach. Crucial details such as whether a dichotomous choice Willingness-To-Pay (WTP) question was employed, the range of random bid values presented (if applicable) to cover the distribution of values, the precise wording of the WTP question, and the payment vehicle through which respondents were expected to contribute.	We thank you for the valuable comment. The explanation is as follows: During the in-person engagement, conversations with household heads, business managers, and owners in flood-exposed areas were generally conducted in Malay, as many residents felt more comfortable speaking their native language. Initially, the conversations were informal but shifted to a more formal tone once participants were willing to engage further. The engagement was conducted cautiously to ensure interviewees received sufficient information about the study's purpose before delving deeper into the willingness-to-pay (WTP) questions. Dealing with flood victims requires a delicate approach because they can be quite emotional about their past flood experiences (Joseph et al., 2015). Providing them with space to express their feelings and experiences builds trust and encourages deeper conversation. It also serves as a way to validate the hardships they have endured during flood events. While descriptions of the psychological and mental health effects of flooding were readily provided to interviewees, allowing self-expression helps them rationalize the importance of measures to reduce anxiety and stress. To ensure that respondents had a consistent understanding, all interviewees were briefed on the effects of stress and anxiety. Additionally, they were informed about the challenges of monetizing intangible flood damage, which requires the adoption of the contingent valuation method (e.g., Markantonis et al., 2012; Semrau et al., 2016; Joseph et al., 2015). To avoid confusing intangible losses with tangible losses (as seen in Kabirzad et al., 2024), and to focus willingness-to-pay (WTP) responses solely on psychological and mental health effects, the distinction between the two was clearly explained to the interviewees. They were advised not to include financial or asset losses in their WTP values (e.g., Foudi et al., 2022) Respondents were presented with a dichotomous choice question on they are willing to pay for flood mitigation that could reduce the intangible damage of flooding. Respondents who answered "yes" were then

	asked with an open-ended question on how much they are willing to pay. Those who stated “no” were asked for their reasons. The other considered information that could be a factor in the intangible damage was then collected from the respondents who were willing to participate. It was obvious that most of those who refused to pay were because of disagreement with the payment vehicle – they argued that investment in flood measures should come from the government of the day and not from the people. Such a protest bid is common in social studies where people are given the choice to either participate or not in interviews. Exclusions of protest bids are also necessary to reduce bias in the analysis. Respondents were presented with a dichotomous choice question asking whether they were willing to pay for flood mitigation measures that could reduce the intangible damage caused by flooding. Those who answered 'yes' were then asked an open-ended question about how much they were willing to pay. Respondents who answered 'no' were asked to provide their reasons. Additional information regarding factors that could influence intangible damage was collected from respondents willing to participate further. It was evident that most who refused to pay did so because they disagreed with the payment vehicle—arguing that investments in flood measures should come from the government rather than individuals. Such protest bids are common in social studies where participants have the choice to participate or not in interviews. Excluding protest bids is necessary to reduce bias in the analysis Using examples of hypothetical and real cases, the amount of money they are willing to/they have paid to reduce the stress and anxiety level was asked (e.g., Rogers et al., 2019; Foudi & Osés-Eraso, 2022). The case used was linked to the worst flood event that they have experienced in the past 10 years of the time when the interviews were conducted. Some of the interviewees have actually implemented concrete barriers at the opening of their house to protect from flooding. Such real case was used as a proxy of the willingness to pay value in reducing the psychological effects of flooding. Example questions are: Using examples of hypothetical and real cases, respondents were asked about the amount of money they are willing to pay or have paid to reduce their stress and anxiety levels related to flooding (e.g., Rogers et al., 2019; Foudi & Osés-Eraso, 2022). The cases referenced were linked to the worst flood events they had experienced within the ten years preceding the interviews. Some interviewees had actually implemented concrete barriers at their house entrances to protect against flooding. Such real cases were used as proxies for the willingness-to-pay (WTP) values aimed at reducing the psychological effects of flooding. Example questions include
--	--

		‘How much are you willing to allocate to make yourself better prepared and reduce your stress and anxiety if the same flood event were to occur?’ ‘If the same event is going to happen, and you were not at home, is the barriers that you constructed able to bring you peace of mind and not be affected as much as when it is not there? How much did you spend to prevent flooding?’ The above explanation will be included in the improved manuscript.
2	analysis of why respondents declined to answer the WTP question or rejected the offered bid values.	We thank for the valuable comment. The explanation is as follows: Obtaining positive first impressions and responses during engagement and interviews, as well as during the elicitation of values for psychological impacts, was challenging. While the sequential steps and tailored approach undertaken during the interview were performed to gain respondents' trust, some have shown disagreement when asked about their willingness to contribute monetarily to safeguard themselves from the psychological effects of flooding. Some of the people approached declined to pay. As what mentioned in the first comment above, it was obvious during the in-person interviews that people who refused to pay were likely due to their disagreement of the payment vehicle – they argued that investment on measures that may able to reduce their stress and anxiety due to flooding should be bared by the government of the day and not by the affected people. In the present study, 35% people that are approached declined to pay. Such a protest bid is common in social studies and requires exclusion to reduce bias in the analysis (Foudi et al, 2022). Essentially, people are given the choice to either participate or not in interviews. The additions above will be included in the improved manuscript.
3	a conceptual question regarding intangible damage comparability across businesses and individuals (might lie in	We thank for the valuable comment. The explanation is as follows: Individuals that were interviewed for intangible losses to businesses were informed about the possible manifestation of stress and anxiety that they could have had experienced during flood events. The collected information of the WTP represents the anxiety and stress at their personal level related to the businesses that

	the pathway through which the damage manifests)	they are managing, and the stress and anxiety stemming from impacts on productivity and disruption of sales, etc. manifested from the condition of flood events that they are in. For example, concerns about employees' well-being, which affects daily operations and services, as well as the difficulty in managing loss in assets, sales, and recovery to the normal state (Lekuthai and Vongvisessomjai, 2001). Whilst there are overlapping pathways of intangible damages on individuals and the businesses that they own or work in, the present study does not express a distinction between the two as it is perceived that the intangible damages can be of any sort of disturbance to the running of the businesses that cannot be monetised, whether it stems from a personal level of the business owner/worker related to the businesses, or from a more specific losses to business, such as loss of opportunity that they are stress and anxious about. The WTP does not consider economic losses that can be monetised indirectly, for example due to business downtime, and this was made clear during the interview (e.g., Darnkachataarn & Kajitani, 2025) Nevertheless, we are aware of the myriad characteristics of ‘flood damage receptors’ that can be of significance to influence the intangible economic losses on business sector. They are inevitably influencing the WTP. Future studies can look into detailing the determinants, such as (1) the respondent job title, (2) the type of products that they are selling, and (3) the nature of their businesses (e.g., using online platform to sell products more than physical)(Joseph et al., 2015;Guntu et al., 2025). The study proves that the variables and sample size provided are not sufficient to address the intangible losses despite the face-to-face efforts. Refinement to the method is necessary, yet the challenge remains due to the nature of businesses. The additions above will be included in the improved manuscript.
4	absence of a table indicating the proportion of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) among business owners.	We thank for the valuable comment. The explanation is as follows: The proportions of different businesses types are as follows: Micro-sized businesses are 86% of the of the total respondents of the business premises, and small to medium-sized enterprises are 24%. The categorization of business premises was based on the total number of workers, as specified by SME Corporation Malaysia (2022). If the number of workers exceeds five permanent employees, the business was classified as small to medium, while businesses with fewer than five employees were categorized as micro-sized businesses. The additions above will be included in the improved manuscript.

	Typo error	We will do a thorough check and proofread in the improved manuscript
5	Include flood histories of the case study areas	We thank for the valuable comment. The explanation is as follows: Flood-prone locations with the stated descriptions in the submitted manuscript were identified through a rigorous review of authorized documents and reports related to floods, such as those published by the Department of Irrigation and Drainage (2012), Kuala Lumpur City Hall (2015), and the National Statistics Department. The selection was also supported by available GIS information, such as the Open Street Map to locate and verify places. Grey literature and open-source websites were also consulted to verify and confirm area selection. "In Kuala Lumpur, the Segambut district was chosen due to evidence of frequent flooding and large-scale evacuations among residents. For instance, in the 2013 flood event, approximately 2,000 residents evacuated from the area (Khairi et al., 2013). In-person interviews with the Kuala Lumpur City Hall authority (DBKL) in 2020 also verified the area's vulnerability to flooding. Similarly, Kajang and Dengkil, in the state of Selangor, have experienced multiple flood events, some of which resulted in significant evacuations. Both areas are situated within the Langat River basin, which has a notable history of flooding. According to state-level flood reports, a 2020 event forced around 200 people in Kajang to evacuate and 500 residents in Dengkil to seek shelter. In Kelantan state, Kota Bharu city has experienced numerous flood events. One example is the devastating flood in 2014, when 20,000 residents were forced to evacuate (Abdullah, 2014). The additions above will be included in the improved manuscript.
6	Is it that individuals are inherently more susceptible to flooding, or is it that, when focusing on intangible damage, there is simply greater scope for experiencing intangible losses when a flood	We thank for the valuable comment. The explanation is as follows: For residential buildings, intangible damages primarily affect personal well-being, including family- or self-related worries, stress, sleep disturbances, and difficulties in managing possessions or recovering to normalcy. In the case of businesses, intangible damages center on concerns about employees' well-being, which impacts daily operations and services, as well as challenges in managing asset losses, drops in sales, and recovery to normal operations. Therefore, comparing intangible damage assessments between

	impacts one's home compared to one's place of business?	households and businesses is difficult, as each context presents distinct forms of evidence for evaluating impact. This is consistent with findings from residential households, where lower income or larger business size does not necessarily mean their willingness to pay (WTP) significantly differs from those with higher income or small to medium business size When comparing the willingness to pay (WTP) of residential households and businesses, residential households report greater intangible losses. The higher WTP among residential households reflects their increased perceived need for interventions to reduce psychological and mental distress caused by floods. However, separate analyses of residential and business WTP, in terms of median values across all income and business size groups, suggest that the findings are not fully conclusive. The comparable median WTP values across different income groups and business sizes indicate that the assumption of income being a decisive factor in reducing intangible damage cannot be confirmed through single-variable analysis. It is important to note that WTP values across groups might vary with a larger sample size. This represents one of the ongoing challenges in collecting data from first-hand flood victims The additions above will be included in the improved manuscript.
7	A clear delineation between intangible and tangible damages. The WTP question (at least as I infer it from the context) likely conflates both tangible and intangible damages with an individual's perceived budget for implementing risk reduction measures.	Tangible flood damages refer to the impacts on the financial and economic conditions of structures exposed to flooding, whether directly or indirectly (e.g., Kabirzad et al., 2024). In contrast, intangible damages relate to the psychological effects experienced by people exposed to floods impacting their homes or business premises. These effects include enduring unprecedented experiences such as losing possessions, impacts on physical health, disruptions to livelihoods, or even the loss of loved ones (e.g., Stanke et al., 2012; Yoda et al., 2017). To distinguish tangible losses of assets and other direct tangible damages, financial impacts were set aside to focus on psychological impacts (e.g., Foudi et al., 2022). This distinction was made clear during the interviews, where respondents' willingness to pay to alleviate psychological and mental burdens during floods was explicitly separated from tangible losses they had experienced. Additional factors related to intangible damage were then collected from respondents who were willing to participate.

		Using examples of hypothetical and real cases, amount of money they willing to/they have paid to reduce the stress and anxiety level were asked (e.g., Rogers et al., 2019; Foudi & Osés-Eraso, 2022). The used case was linked to the worst flood event that they have experienced in the past 10 years of the time when the interviews were conducted. Some of the interviewees have actually implemented concrete barriers at the opening of their house to protect from flooding. Such real case was used as proxy of the willingness to pay value in reducing the psychological effects of flooding. Example questions are: ‘How much are you willing to allocate to make yourself better prepared and reduce your stress and anxiety if the same flood event were to occur?’ ‘If the same event is going to happen, and you were not at home, is the barriers that you constructed able to bring you peace of mind and not affected as much as when it is not there? How much did you spend to prevent flooding?’ The additions above will be included in the improved manuscript.
8	the survey was conducted post-flood, significant variations in recovery rates would be expected. Therefore, why is it that the regression modeling/survey did not incorporate any variables related to the recovery process?	The study aimed to assess intangible damage using multiple possible contributing variables, focusing on conditions related to the flood, building, and socioeconomic characteristics of the particular household or business premises during the flood events only. The recovery rates are not explicitly informed, but is assumed to be implicit in other variables. However, we agree that the response recovery is a valuable indicator for intangible flood damage and can lead to a more specific non-structural measure to reduce intangible damage. The manuscript will highlight that further study should account for the response recovery as one of the governing variables.
9	absence of a regression analysis for the business observations Some form of variable reduction process was undertaken (Table 4)	Among all ten independent variables, only seven were considered for the business regression analysis because variables related to households—such as family size, having children, and/or elderly members—apply only to household characteristics. Income showed a positive correlation, while business duration (in years) was negatively correlated. Meanwhile, multicollinearity was checked to identify highly correlated independent variables. After assessing correlations with coefficients greater than 0.5, the variance inflation factor (VIF) scores of those variables were evaluated. Variables with high VIF scores, such as flood duration, were removed from the analysis

		The regression analysis for business premises is as follows: the p-value associated with the regression model is 0.15, which exceeds the threshold, suggesting a failure to reject the null hypothesis. This indicates that the selected factors do not significantly predict intangible damage within the business sector. Among all considered variables, only income shows a statistically significant relationship with intangible damage. Another study by Czajkowski and Cunha (2020) found that income is not a significant variable for intangible damage to business premises, unlike flood duration, building type, and building height An R^2 value of 0.28 indicates that the independent variables explain 28% of the variability in the outcome. While this may be considered low in some contexts, an R^2 of 0.10 or even lower can be acceptable in certain situations, as numerous other factors could also influence the outcome (Hair et al., 2018). It is noteworthy that the findings on variable significance contrast with other research. Other flood damage studies have commonly used a p-value threshold of 0.05 to determine significance (Wijayanti et al., 2017; Svenningsen et al., 2020). This result leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis, indicating that the factors under consideration do not significantly predict intangible damage within the business sector. The additions above will be included in the improved manuscript.
10	At best, the CVM, within the constraints of an individual's budget, provides a measure of their willingness to pay to reduce such damage. However, this is not synonymous with the actual intangible damage itself, although the two are undeniably related.	Willingness to pay (WTP) is employed in this paper as a method to elicit value, supported by the contingent valuation (CV) stated preference method. The aim is to quantify the psychological and health impacts—a form of intangible damage—associated with residential buildings and business premises. Using these methods, the article estimates the non-market value of stress, distress, and worries, capturing the intangible effects of flooding. The actual intangible damages associated with the exposed elements can be comparatively very high and include cultural loss, ecosystem damage, environmental loss, loss of memorabilia, trauma, and loss of trust (Hammond et al., 2013; Nafari & Mendis, 2018; Olesen et al., 2017). These represent other types of intangible damage that can be considered in future research The additions above will be included in the improved manuscript.
11	"An Assessment of the Willingness to Pay for Flood Risk Reduction: A Case Study in Peninsular	Thank you for the suggestion. The study defines psychological health impacts as stress, emotional instability, wariness, and anxiety that befall people directly experienced with flooding, and attempts to monetize the impacts using the WTP

	Malaysia," which, while still valuable, addresses a slightly less novel research question. Addressing this question would require a different framing of the paper, and which would open further questions about why the socio-psychological domain of variables and welfare with was not included in the paper (e.g., where are risk perceptions as someone who expects to be flooded again may have even larger intangible impacts because they are "stuck") given that psychological damage is psychological and will be driven by the interaction with other tangible and intangible factors.	method. We are aware of the possible conceptual arguments that may arise with respect to the factors that can lead to psychological health impacts of flooding, but we are limiting the variables to a number that are manageable in the context of the present study. As for the people's perception, this is a topic that is also important and will influence the WTP. The people being interviewed in the present study were those who had experienced flooding at the place where they were interviewed (post-event). It is assumed that they are aware of the risk that they are exposed to, and the WTP that they have provided was in view of floods that may occur again in the future. In fact, the questions that were put forward for them to provide the WTP were based on the depth and duration of the same extreme event that they had experienced. Therefore, it is assumed that the influence of perception to the WTP that they provided is minimal. The present study attempts to frame the psychological health impact in the context of cost-benefit analysis, where monetary metric was used as the decision support metric. The CBA often neglects the intangible damages that could lead to malinvestment in flood risk mitigation efforts. Even if investments were allocated for reducing mental burden, justifications were difficult to make in terms of how much public spending a case would require. Moreover, allocations to reduce psychological effects are usually prompted reactively. The present study attempts to incorporate the subjective experiences of people exposed to flooding in the risk-based flood investment decision-making. Albeit the wide range of extended research avenues that can be explored under the theme of psychological effects of flooding, the present study is part of the limited studies attempting to provide evidence of intangible flood damages of the residential and business sectors. Depending on a study's perspective, future work can discern the type and degree of intangible losses and incorporate more social variables into the intangible flood losses analysis. Thank you for the suggestion. The 'intangible losses' is a common term used in flood damage analysis in the context of flood risk management literature, hence it is deemed necessary to be maintained in the title.
--	--	---