

Editor Comment:

The authors have satisfactorily responded to the reviewer comments. There are just a few technical corrections left to be done:

Abstract:

Please explain notion of “development pathways crossroads”.

Authors’ response:

We added a brief definition of development pathway crossroads in the abstract, line 16: “defined as a critical point whereby actors in conflict will either reinforce the current business-as-usual pathway based on large supply augmentation or implement alternative solutions for the urban water system.””

Editor Comment:

Introduction:

Line 55, “to test this approach”: Please define the approach you refer to here. But maybe testing an approach is not the right wording here.

Authors’ response:

We changed the wording as follows: “To test and analyse the concept of development pathway crossroads, we draw on empirical work...”

Editor Comment:

Section 2:

Line 104: I don’t think critical studies developed these concepts “to fill this gap in the natural sciences” – consider revising. You could use something like “meanwhile ...” to contrast the previous paragraph.

Authors’ response:

We accepted the suggestion of the editor and replaced the sentence of line 106 with “Meanwhile, critical studies...”.

Editor Comment:

Methodology:

Line 131: Conducting an approach is probably not the right wording. Conducting a study? Taking an approach?

Authors’ response:

We changed the wording to “...we conducted an inter- and transdisciplinary study.”

L 139: I believe it is “participant observation”.

Authors’ response:

Indeed, we corrected the term.