

The paper has substantially improved after the last round of revisions and is nearly ready for publication. Some small technical corrections are still needed and some sections are still a bit long and can benefit from shortening.

Case-study description can be shortened by removing line 144-153 as you already refer to many papers that are describing the impact of these floods in detail.	This section was added following review 2 comments to explain why we focus on the slopes in the Wupper around Leverkusen Opladen and Schlebusch, and the riparian in the Erft near Blessem for the spatial analyses. This section is necessary to the whole paper, if the reviewer can't understand without this section why those areas are targeted, perhaps other readers will also not understand.
The method section can benefit from some relocation of paragraphs to make it a bit easier, going from the overarching concepts to technical details in a more structured manner. (e.g. Keep all GIS-related work in the GIS-paragraph, which might be subdivided into a general mapping and the TWI analysis). So, start with 'classification of different types of NbS (now starting at line 186), followed by 'where did you get the data from', followed by GIS analysis – subdivided in the layer creation and the TWI analysis and the sinuosity analysis.	We think that it makes more sense to discuss data sourcing first, because that was the first step. Once we had sourced the data, identified and mapped the existing and planned NbS, which was the second step, the NbS was classified, this was the third step. We have moved the paragraph on quantifying flood impact and added a new heading 3.2 Layer creation to document hazards, landscape characteristics and the existing and planned NbS to separate this information from the 3.1 data sourcing and 3.3 GIS analysis steps.
(in the heading in line 203 you use 'additional NbS'=> better rephrase to 'nbs for slopes'/sloping terrain.	It is not simply NbS for slopes or sloping terrain. While the sloping terrain is found across the Wupper basin in the study area, the area that we are suggesting requires additional NbS in the study area of the Erft basin has flat terrain.
Remove the last sentence of the method that refers to results (line 227).	We have the same sentences at the end of 3.1 and 3.2, we suspect that it is the use of the word results that you object to in the method section so have changed the wording.
In the results part there are some paragraphs that are better positioned in the discussion: e.g. line 251-257. In that paragraph, remove the word 'however', in the same line you refer to 'field observations' that you haven't mentioned in the methods. Do you mean your general knowledge of the area? (or did you go out in the field to survey?)	OK, done, paragraphs moved to discussion and however removed. Yes, it is our general knowledge of the area.
Also sentences starting from line 260 with 'priorities' to the end of the next paragraph are not results but discussion.	Agreed, sentences moved to discussion.
In the discussion section stick more to the core messages of the paper and don't waste words on too general issues. E.g. remove in line 420 'an important historical waterway in western	We have removed some phrases including the suggested 'historical waterway' sentence.

europe’ and the sentence ‘throughout history....’	
Remove more references and sentences to the flood in 2021- that event is not the point of the discussion. The discussion should be much more about your mapping and the help it brings to understanding how at a wider scale there are option for measures to mitigate the flood risks. (e.g. the discussion around line 450).	Agreed. We have removed some sentences that are related to the 2021 Flood event.
Move sentence ‘further analysis....’ In line 469 further down. First finalize the discussion on what the TWI brought you in terms of insights. Only afterwards mention that always more work is needed.	OK, done.
Make the discussion on TWI and Sinuosity more separate. E.g. now you suddenly start to talk about it in line 473, but it’s better to make the disssion on the sinuosity a separate paragraph: why was it helpful to use it, and how did it matter. Same for the TWI, start a paragraph with a sentence on the TWI and discuss its usefulness as a method.	OK, done. OK, two sentences added for each.
Line 484 – remove the word ‘importantly’ (similar in some more places, try to avoid these ‘judgemental words’, similar to ‘also’ and ‘however’, ‘crucial’ etc..)	Done.
The end of the discussion is a bit too general, suggest to remove line 545 to 565.	We have removed lines 548 to 564 but kept line 545 to 547, as we consider this aspect important for the discussion. We have even added the following sentence: The 2026 European heatwaves once again highlight the need for NbS, which provide a wide range of regulating ecosystem services and thus ensure resilience to both floods as well as heat and drought.