We would like to thank the anonymous referee for the time he/she has taken to read our manuscript and his/her helpful comments to improve it and gain clarity. In the following section, we are going to repeat the points brought up (in grey italic letters) and subsequently respond to them:

Abstract

Line 18-20: This sentence is very difficult to read please divide it into two sentences. – We will change this sentence accordingly.

Line 23-24: Revise the sentence sintaxis, very difficult to read-– We will change this sentence accordingly.

Line 25: Delete "for" after "allows".– will be corrected

Introduction

Line 40-44: Please divide this sentences into two or serveral sentences, is to difficult to read.
We will revise these sentences to make them clearer.

Line 46-47: This information is already included in Table 3, please delete. – will be corrected

Line 50: Delete "for example" - We will change this to "among others" as we mention the most common influences.

Line 57: Delete the comma, instead place TPs in parenthesis. – will be corrected

Line 57-58: This sentence should be at the end of the paragraph. – We will revise this paragraph.

Line 77: Geometry? – We will add this and refer to Burkhardt et al., 2012.

Line 81: "Studies have confirmed…"– will be corrected

Line 86: Please delete the comma and better add swale-trench system in parenthesis. – We will correct the comma. We are aware that various terms exist for urban storm water infiltration systems. We will define the term swale-trench system more clearly by referring to the study of Hensen et al., 2018.

Line 88-89: This sentence is very difficult to read. – We will improve this sentence.

Methods

Line 109-110: MEC/PNEC where chosen for what? Which criterion? Relevance threshold?
In a first step, the objective was to determine the relevance of biocides in our study area. We chose MEC/PNEC >1 as a common threshold for environmental risk assessment. We are aware that our study is not a complete environmental risk assessment. Our objective rather was to have a defined starting point for further investigations. See also our answers to referee #1 Ute Schoknecht.

Line 115: Please add coordinates - We will add coordinates: 47° 59N 7° 51E.

Line 126-128: Please add here the total facade area if possible, or size of the buildings and roof top total area approx. Its important to have an idea of the biocide loads from each of the buildings or from the total building complex.
Thank you for your suggestion. We will add information on the geometry of the buildings.

Line 131-134: Please add the pipeline/drainage material- We will add the material.

Line 152-155: Please add the total amount of samples within the test period
We will change Table 1 so that the number of samples becomes clearer. See also our answers to referee #1 Ute Schoknecht.

Line 180: Is this leaching test out of norm/standard (i.e DSLT) or it is a self fabricated test? If it is, please argue why you do the leaching test that way.
The aim here was to account if any leaching takes place at all. That is why we used a self-fabricated test. The first leaching test did not show any biocide concentrations. Further elution experiments at other parts of the wooden terrace confirmed that this was not a biocide source. We will discuss this in the updated manuscript.

Line 195: Instead of "measurement" use "analysis".– will be corrected

Table 3: Please add water solubility, half-life time, molecular mass and lethal dose. – We will add this information.

Results
Line 245: "There, diuron showed maximum concentrations of…"– will be corrected

Line 255: Please add weather data elsewhere in studied area/sampling site (methods section). Here you argue about weather conditons in the area but there is no information of it prior this argumentation.
We did not have a weather station in the immediate district, but relied on a weather station about 5km away from the study area, see 2.3.1. We will stress this in the updated methodology. In Fig. 4 used rainfall data to illustrate rainfall magnitudes during the sampled events. We will add the amount of precipitation in an updated figure.

Section 3.2.1: Does the impinged water volumes have an influence in the leaching concentrations? All the facades received the same amount of water? Are collected runoffs in the same order? It is important to mention this since the leaching amount of substances is also dependant on the contact water volume. Higher the runoff volume, higher the substance load.

Please mention in this section something about the contact water volume, it is an important parameter into consideration when talking about substance leaching of facades. Consider biocide loads (mg/m² or µg/m²) in this section, since this measurement is important for environmental evaluation properties of any construction site.
Thank you for your comment. We are aware that the impinged water volume has an influence on the leaching concentrations. We conducted the elution experiments as similar as possible to reduce such influences. Collected runoff volumes were in the same order of magnitude, about 1L.
We sprinkled about 1L across 0.25m² and collected the entire runoff (see 2.3.2). We repeated these experiments twice at each investigated façade and found similar concentrations in the obtained duplicates. We will clarify this point in the discussion of the updated manuscript and stress that the results should not be evaluated quantitatively but rather qualitatively in a sense that a specific biocide was detected or not. This also due to the fact that information on initial biocide loads could not be determined for all buildings (see 2.2).

Line 421: Please delete "Again"`– will be corrected

References

Burkhardt, M., Zuleeg, S., Vonbank, R., Bester, K., Carmeliet, J., Boller, M., and Wangler, T.: Leaching of biocides from façades under natural weather conditions, Environmental science & technology, 46, 5497–5503, doi:10.1021/es2040009, 2012.

Hensen, B., Lange, J., Jackisch, N., Zieger, F., Olsson, O., and Kümmerer, K.: Entry of biocides and their transformation products into groundwater via urban stormwater infiltration systems, Water research, 144, 413–423, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.07.046, 2018.