

We would like to thank Referee #1 for his/her interest in the topic and for valuable comments to improve the manuscript. A point-by-point response to the comments is as follows.

R: Referee

A: Authors

General comments:

R: Talking of what pursued by the paper, the type of methodology followed seems to me sound, but it would be helpful to readers to know which are the informative basis required to elaborate the maps of synthesis that the paper shows (i.e. essentially all the Figures, except Figure 2), and how much time the elaborations took to be performed (of each of them). It is an information that would be nice to have in order to quantify the feasibility of what has been done as a prototype, and should be added to the paper in form of tables and/or a paragraph, in case in an Appendix. Example: Figure 3 requires y,w,z, data and took x man/days to be elaborated subsequently).

A: We agree with this comments. In fact, the informative basis required has been extensively described in Table 7 of the companion paper (Part1: Physical-Environmental Assessment). However a new reference has been added in the revised manuscript, together with a tentative estimation of the work load required for the different steps.

R: The only scientific doubt that the paper raises is if a more in-deep literature review of existing methodologies of socio-economical analysis, like multicriteria analysis or others, should be pursued. When the indicators are put together in the last part of the paper (i.e. section 7) a feeling of a certain arbitrariness of the choices remains, and the indicator themselves are a little simplistic, but reasonable and defensible. The literature that comes from the crossing of environmental planning, sociology and economics, is partially unknown to hydrologists and geoscientists, and I am sure that there some of the problematic revealed, for instance in weighting the indicators, have been largely discussed and a scholar analysis of alternatives should be a valuable add-on of the amount of work already made.

A: We agree with this comments. In fact, the literature review on MCDA has been performed in the companion paper (Part1: Physical-Environmental Assessment) with updated relevant references. However, a new reference has been added and the revised manuscript has been modified accordingly.

R: The paper is generally well written, however, I believe that Introduction should be partially rewritten to be more fluid.

A: We agree with this comments. The revised manuscript has been modified accordingly.

Specific comments:

R: Maybe in line 3 of page 7897, “those whose” could be substituted with “those events whose”

A: We agree with this comments. The revised manuscript has been modified accordingly.