

Reviewer number one had a few editorial questions/ suggestions. Here is how I have addressed them:

1. Is Water board Dommel the official name of the board? If so, 'board' should also be capitalized. If not, the 'Dommel water board' would be the correct syntax.

Reply: It is. Whenever 'water board' is part of a proper name, I have capitalised 'board' as well.

2. In the list of potential data source I would cut 'old' from the description of maps, surveys, laws, etc. as both old and current maps, etc. are useful data sources.

Reply: Done

3. On page 11, line 25 clarify the meaning of 'they'. It is not clear if they refers to provincial, local and / or EU level governmental bodies.

Reply: 'They' refers to the subject of the previous sentence, 'the different governmental bodies', hence to all governmental bodies existing at the time.

4. Overall, the writing is a bit informal, though it is clear. I recommend the author review the manuscript with a focus on writing style. The last paragraph jumped out to me as particularly informal.

Reply: I have tried to use plain and active language that is understandable for educated persons whatever their disciplinary background. The result may be a bit informal. However, I have reviewed the whole manuscript and replaced some colloquial words and expressions (e.g. 'a lot of' by 'much'). In the last paragraph, first sentence, I have replaced 'I could' by 'it would be possible to'. In addition, I have made a few other minor adjustments to improve flow (e.g. split a sentence in two or used a different conjunction) and corrected some typos.