

Thank you to both the reviewers and the authors for their comments and responses. I am happy with the discussion so far, but there are a few points that I would like to emphasise. I am happy to see a revised manuscript based on the authors' responses, but I will expect the following points to be clearly addressed in the revision:

I agree with R1 about the problems caused by introducing the participatory workshops in the Discussion section. In a paper that evaluates the web app, the description of these workshops gives the impression that they were part of this evaluation process. However, the authors state that "this was not an evaluation of the web app, also because the app did not yet exist when these participatory processes happened".

I understand entirely why the reviewer understood it in this way. It is particularly easy to see how this confusion arises when the section is called **"Usage of information provided by the CCIWR Explorer in local participatory processes for climate change adaptation"**.

I also misunderstood this subsection initially. I assumed that it was about using the CCIWR Explorer in participatory processes, whereas it is actually about previous participatory processes in which similar data and visualisations were used. This is a different story. I understand that the authors learnt from these experiences and that these lessons are relevant when considering how the CCIWR Explorer might be used. However, it feels out of place to use around two pages of the Discussion to describe these previous processes when the app itself was not used in them.

The authors' final point is nevertheless valid, and I would recommend starting from this point instead. For example: **"Based on [our] experiences with previous participatory processes, we recommend..."** The previous processes can then be referred to briefly as the basis for these recommendations. Alternatively, the description of these processes needs to be reduced considerably. It does not make sense to use around one third of the Discussion discussing processes in which the app was not used.

I would also ask the authors to be careful with formulations such as **"the referee expected"**. The referee did not necessarily have a particular expectation. Rather, the referee communicated how they understood the research story based on their reading of the manuscript. If the reviewer understood the story differently from what the authors intended, this indicates that the way the story is communicated in the manuscript needs to be clarified. In this case, I think the reviewer's interpretation was entirely understandable.

Otherwise, I am happy with the authors' responses to RC2 and the proposed alterations to the text. I am glad to see that "Local Insights" will be clarified, since this is a potentially problematic phrase when referring to data at 0.5° resolution.

These are not really "local insights" in the normal meaning of the term. They are the values for the selected 0.5° grid cell. The term clearly causes confusion for readers, including both myself and the reviewer. Rather than explaining why the term "local" might be considered inappropriate, I would suggest simply being precise about what

the application provides. For example: **“When a user clicks on the map, the application dynamically renders percentile boxes showing P10, P30, P50 (median), P70, and P90 values for the selected 0.5° grid cell.”** If “Local Insights” is the actual name used in the interface, this can of course be stated, but it should be made clear that this is the name of the feature rather than a description of the spatial scale of the information.