Comments of Reviewer 3 (Anonymous Referee) and responses

Comment 1: page 6400, line 23: You mentioned different types of cycles that can be used and different versions that are published (with some references). Then you start the following sentence by referring to one specific cycle that you don't mention with specific literature. Moreover it is quite confusing the number of phases and the types of these.

Response 1: We agree that this paragraph needs to be revised, as referee 2 also criticized its clarity. Therefore we rephrased the paragraph (see reviewer 2, response 8).

Comment 2: page 6401, line 17: According to your objectives, you said that the level of preparedness and reaction might also depend on the flood characteristic. This is one of your findings; it is a hypothesis or has literature background?

Response 2: In our study we hypothesize that early warning, emergency response, and finally damages are significantly influenced by the regional topography and flood characteristics. Yet, many studies confirm the link between lead time and early warning, but also the influence of the flood type (e.g. Handmer and Ord, 1986; Sorensen and Mileti, 1989; Parker et al., 2008; Golding, 2009; Parker et al., 2009; Steinführer and Kuhlicke, 2009; Molinari et al., 2013). However, we do not believe that the level of preparedness is also dependent on lead time and flood characteristics. According to our analyses, experience of flooding and risk awareness are more decisive in this respect.

Comment 3: page 6402, line 25: Typing error, (: : :) temperatures rose rapidly from (instead of "to") 5 to 15 °C (: : :)

Response 3: Corrected.

Comment 4: page 6423: APPENDIX A - The contents of the appendix A (Tab. A1 and A2) are not necessary in order to clarify any part of the study. In section 3.1 you could mention the difficulty to interview the household, without any table.

Response 4: Thank you for your suggestion. We will delete both tables and alternatively will indicate some of the difficulties we had interviewing the respondents in section 3.1.

Comment 5: page 6427, line 9 and 11: Typing error, LfU (Bavarian Environment Agency).

Response 5: Thank you. This will be corrected.

Comment 6: page 6440, Tab. 11: Is not clear how this table has been made. There is any statistic range you chose for saying "Low" instead of "Medium" or "Bad"?

Response 6: In this study, no statistical criteria were used for the evaluation of each aspect. Instead, we used three qualitative categories (e.g. low / medium / high). The main intention was to give a brief summary of all the results for the five different flood events presented in the paper. All details and numbers are given in the respective chapters of the article. Indeed, the evaluation is based on our interpretation of the results and could be further discussed.

Additional references

Handmer, J. W., Ord, K. D. (1986): Flood warning and response, in: Smith, D. I., Handmer, J.W. (eds.): Flood warning in Australia, Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, Canberra, 235-257.

Parker, D. J., Priest, S., Schildt, A., Handmer, J. (2008): Modelling the Damage Reducing Effects of Flood Warnings. FLOODsite Final Report T10-07-12. Flood Hazard Research Centre, Middlesex university: London.

Parker, D. J., Priest, S., Tapsell, S. M. (2009): Understanding and enhancing the public's behavioural response to flood warning information. Meteorological Application 16(1), 103-114.

Sorensen, J., Mileti, D. (1989): Warning and evacuation: answering some basic questions, Industrial Crisis Quarterly 2, 195-210.

Steinführer, A., Kuhlicke, C. (2007): Social vulnerability and the 2003 flood. Country Report Germany (Mulde River). FLOODsite Report No. T11-07-08. UFZ: Leipzig.