

Dear reviewers,

Thank you very much for your positive feedback and the additional remarks. We quickly go through your points, which we all incorporated into our manuscript:

- 5        1) Somehow, we missed the UQ paper by Apel et al. from 2008 in our literature review/introduction, but we agree it should not be missing. Therefore, we added the reference in the introduction.
- 10       2) We added detention basins as an example for mitigation measures whose effect is propagated downstream.
- 15       3) We agree that the reason behind the fact that we do not show numerical values for the benefit PDFs remained not fully clear. We adjusted the explanation and are happy to hear your feedback. The full explanation to why we do not show numbers: unfortunately, the results of the cost-benefit analysis of the detention basins are not officially published yet (and they result from a project funded by the Bavarian State) because the climate inputs might need to be corrected/refined in the future. Until then, we are not allowed to show the benefit or benefit-cost ratio, which could easily be deduced from Fig.13 (if it had numbers). In contrast to that, it is not possible to obtain a good estimate of the benefit by looking at Fig. 20       12, which made it possible for us to put numerical values on its y-axis.
- 4) Instead of changing 'are' to 'can be', we changed 'explicitly' (which was not the case, as you argued correctly) to 'implicitly'.
- 25       5) We added a sentence that discusses exactly what you point out.

We hope that our revisions adequately address your comments, and we appreciate the opportunity to improve the manuscript once again. Thank you!