

Dear authors,
Comments from two reviewers have been received. Still minor corrections are needed for possible publication in HESS. Please have a look and see if these corrections are possible.
Best regards,
Yue-Ping

Reviewer 1

Minor revisions are required to improve consistency of tables and interpretability of graphical figures.

Thank you so much for your time, once again. We went through all the comments you made in the annotated manuscript and corrected all the typos. We added all the horizontal lines in tables and modified the pie charts according to your suggestions. While doing that, we noticed that the colormap was not cividis (although it was colour-blindness friendly). We have modified it so that now it really is cividis. We also noticed a mix-up of the figures that must have happened during the conversion from tables to figure (previous round of revision) and corrected it. We also adjusted the figure captions. Finally, because we still wanted to convey quantitative information, we mentioned the largest percentages from the former tables directly in the text (not in the pie charts). We hope those further improvements will make the manuscript ready for publication.

Reviewer 2

Overall, the authors have made significant improvements to the paper, addressing most of the concerns raised during the initial review process. They lighted their innovation point and contribution to previous literature by emphasizing their survey on visualization of probabilistic flood forecast maps. They also pointed out the limitation of the qualitative design of the study. The structure and tables/graphs have been improved with mistakes corrected. Up to now, there are only still a few technical issues that require attention before the paper can be considered ready for publication.

Thank you also for your time, once more. We appreciate the time and effort you spent on this.

1. Full name should be given for the first abbreviation in the paper. In L150, Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System for HEC-RAS. In L397, "DEH" can be confusing.

This has been corrected (lines 151-152 of the tracked-changes version of the revised manuscript)

2. In L647, the spelling error: "en".

This has also been corrected (line 651, tracked-changes version)

I appreciate the authors' efforts in addressing the previous concerns, and I believe that with these small issues addressed, the paper can make a valuable contribution to the field.

Thank you very much!